

THE
METHODIST MAGAZINE,
AND
Quarterly Review.

VOL. XII, No. 4. OCTOBER, 1830. NEW SERIES—VOL. I, No. 4.

REVIEW.

Theological Institutes : or a View of the Evidences, Doctrines, Morals, and Institutions of Christianity. BY RICHARD WATSON. *First American, from the second London edition. Three volumes octavo, pp. 1480. New-York, Published by J. Emory & B. Waugh, (late N. Bangs & J. Emory,) for the Methodist Episcopal Church, at the Conference Office, 14 Crosby-street.*

Concluded from page 307.

AT the conclusion of the Third Part of his *Theological Institutes*, Mr. Watson proves, by evidence which no just argumentation can ever refute, the entire and universal depravity of human nature ; and in the Fourth Part, he investigates the gracious provision made by the Almighty for the recovery of his degenerate offspring to his favour, and to purity, as preparatory to their final acceptance and glorification. The momentous question respecting the possibility of that recovery could never have been determined by the human mind, had it been left to its own unassisted reasonings and speculations ; much less could the manner of its accomplishment have ever been satisfactorily ascertained. For, whatever hope of salvation from sin, and its fearful consequences, might have been excited by a contemplation of the attribute of Divine goodness, (for of that modification of goodness which is called *mercy*, sinful men could have no adequate conception without a revelation,) that hope must have been speedily extinguished by serious reflection upon the essential purity and justice of God, which had already declared ‘death’ to be the penalty of transgression. Repentance, however deep and sincere, can give no title to pardon ; as it neither alters the nature of the sin which has been committed, nor offers any atonement to the justice of the offended Lawgiver : and to expect forgiveness upon repentance, in every instance of transgression, would be, in fact, to assume that the moral government of God was repealed. But it may be asked, Whence is this supposed repentance to originate ? A being that is totally depraved is, of himself, incapable of repentance, any farther than he may feel terror and alarm for the consequences of guilt. Sin is the element of fallen man, and holiness is an object of his absolute aversion. He cannot, therefore, of himself, feel ingenuous sorrow for having offended his Creator and benefactor, by the violation of that law ‘which is holy, and just, and good ;’ any more than he can make

an effectual effort to abandon the practice of sin, and to escape out of the snare of the devil. A distinct revelation of pardoning mercy from God, therefore, was indispensably necessary, in order that fallen man might possess satisfactory information on the subject; and he must be brought under a divine influence, or he can never either repent or be converted. And hence it does not appear, from the inspired narrative, that our first parents, after the fall, had any expectation of pardon,—that they offered to God one single petition for that blessing, or even expressed the slightest regret for their sin,—until they had received an intimation of Divine mercy through the gracious interference of ‘the seed of the woman.’

One great object of Divine revelation therefore is, to assure mankind that there is forgiveness with God, and to point out the particular manner in which it is conveyed. The justice of God required, that without the ‘*shedding of blood*’ there should be ‘no remission.’ But it was ‘not possible that the blood of bulls and goats’ should make an adequate atonement for human guilt. There is no equivalence of value between the lives of all the brute animals in the universe, and the intelligent and immortal soul of one human being. And yet here are millions of such beings, ‘guilty before God,’ and exposed to ‘the vengeance of eternal fire.’ To meet their case, the Divine Son of God assumed the nature of man, and in that nature was ‘obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.’ His life-blood, which he voluntarily shed, was designed to atone for the sin of the world; and his Divinity gave a value, a preciousness, to his sacrifice, which exceeds all human thought. By the vicarious sufferings of Jesus Christ, a way is opened for the communication of pardon, and of every other blessing to mankind, in perfect consistency with the justice and purity of God, and the honour of his government. According to the testimony of Scripture, the design of the Almighty in this procedure was, ‘to declare his *righteousness*,—that he might be *just*,’ and yet the most merciful ‘Justifier of him that believeth in Jesus:’ Rom. iii, 25, 26; and indeed, considering the infinite dignity and glory of Christ’s person in his sufferings, both in the garden and upon the cross, the essential justice of God is more strikingly ‘declared,’ than it would have been by the endless perdition of the whole human race. The sacrifice of Jesus Christ, therefore, which forms the basis of his intercession, constitutes a solid ground of confidence towards God; and an inspired Apostle has taught us to conclude, that ‘He that spared not his own Son,’ who was essentially one with himself, ‘but delivered him up for us all,’ will ‘with him also freely give us all things.’ Rom. viii, 32.

The spirit of infidelity, however, which prompts some men to reject the revelation of God altogether, has led others, while they have professed to receive that revelation with gratitude and humility, to deny and explain away its peculiar and distinguishing truths.

And hence the evangelical doctrine of atonement for sin by the death of Christ, notwithstanding the glory which it reflects upon the Divine character and government, and 'the great and endless comfort' which it brings to the penitent sinner, has been strenuously opposed; and all the arts of metaphysical reasoning, and verbal criticism, have been resorted to, for the purpose of persuading mankind that there is no more atoning virtue in the blood of Christ than in their own tears. Errors on this subject are likely to lead to the most serious results. For if the grand condition of our personal justification before God, be faith in the blood of Christ, as the apostle states, Rom. iii, 25, then those who regard that blood as 'a common thing,' are left in a situation, the peril of which no language can fully describe. Under a deep impression of the immense importance of this subject, Mr. Watson states the scriptural doctrine of atonement, and then adduces, in its support, the evidence which is furnished by the inspired writers, to whose decisions all his reasonings are subordinated. In connexion with these subjects, he discusses at considerable length the principles of God's moral government, and the origin of primitive sacrifices: and in reference to the last of these subjects, he controverts the theory of Mr. Davison, who contends that animal sacrifices were not originally either of Divine institution, or of an atoning character; but were presented by men to God as the spontaneous result of grateful feeling. In the discussion of this question, that gifted member of the University of Oxford, though treated by Mr. Watson with perfect decorum, appears to little advantage, either as a reasoner or a theologian. On the whole subject of atonement and sacrifice, we have no hesitation in saying, that there exists not in our language a body of scriptural evidence so comprehensive, and yet condensed, as that given in the work before us. The reasoning is remarkably powerful and convincing, and cannot fail to produce the most beneficial effects in the minds of those who read with a sincere desire to know the truth. In consecutive and lengthened argumentation, it is difficult to select passages for extracts, whatever excellence they may possess, without weakening their effect; some specimens of this part of the work, however, it is requisite that we should lay before our readers. In reply to the Socinian objection, that there is no wrath in God, and that an atonement was therefore unnecessary, Mr. Watson remarks:—

'Unable, then, as they who deny the vicarious nature of the sufferings of Christ are to evade the testimony of the above passages which speak of our Lord as a propitiation, what is their next resource? They deny the existence of wrath in God, in the hope of proving that propitiation, in a *proper sense*, cannot be the doctrine of Scripture, whatever may be the force of the mere *terms* which the sacred writers employ. In order to give plausibility to their statement, they pervert and caricature the opinion of the orthodox, and argue as though it formed a part of the doctrine of Christ's propitiation and oblation for

sin, that God is naturally an implacable and vengeful being, only made placable and disposed to show mercy by satisfaction being made to his displeasure through our Lord's sufferings and death. This is as contrary to Scripture as it is to the opinions of all sober persons who hold the doctrine of Christ's atonement. God is love; but it is not necessary, in order to support this truth, to assume that he is nothing else. He has, as we have seen, other attributes, which harmonize with this and with each other, though, assuredly, that harmony cannot be exhibited by any who deny the propitiation for sin made by the death of Christ. Their system, therefore, obliges them to deny the existence of some of the attributes of God, or to explain them away.

It is sufficient to show that there is not only no implacability in God, but a most tender and placable affection towards the sinning human race itself, that the Son of God, by whom the propitiation was made, was the free gift of the Father to us. This is the most eminent proof of his love, that for our sakes, and that mercy might be extended to us, "he spared not his own Son; but delivered him up freely for us all." Thus he is the *fountain* and first moving cause of that scheme of recovery and salvation, which the incarnation and death of our Lord brought into full and efficient operation. The question, indeed, is not whether God is love, or whether he is of a placable nature; in that we are agreed: but it is, whether God is holy and just; whether we, his creatures, are under law or not; whether this law has any penalty, and whether God, in his rectoral character, is bound to execute and uphold that law. These are points which have already been established, and as the justice of God is punitive, (for if it is not punitive, his laws are a dead letter,) then is there *wrath* in God; then is God *angry* with the wicked; then is man, as a sinner, obnoxious to this *anger*; and so a propitiation becomes necessary to turn it away from him. Nor are these terms unscriptural; they are used in the New Testament as emphatically as in the Old, though, in a special sense, a revelation of the mercy of God to man. John the Baptist declares that, if any man believeth not in the Son of God, "the *wrath of God* abideth upon him." St. Paul declares, that "the *wrath of God* is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men." The day of judgment is, with reference to the ungodly, said to be "the day of *wrath*;" God is called "a *consuming fire*;" and, as such, is the object of "reverence and godly fear." Nor is this his displeasure light, and the consequences of it a trifling and temporary inconvenience. When we only regard the consequences which have followed sin in society, from the earliest ages, and in every part of the world, and add to these the many direct and fearful inflictions of punishment which have proceeded from the "Judge of the whole earth," to use the language of Scripture, "our flesh may well tremble because of his judgments." But when we look at the future state of the wicked, as it is represented in Scripture, though expressed generally, and surrounded as it is with the mystery of a world, and a condition of being, unknown to us in the present state, all evils which history has crowded into the lot of man, appear insignificant in comparison of banishment from God, separation from the good, public condemnation, torment of spirit, "weeping, wailing, and gnashing of

teeth," "everlasting destruction," "everlasting fire." Let men talk ever so much and eloquently of the pure benevolence of God, they cannot abolish the facts recorded in the history of human suffering in this world as the effect of transgression; nor can they discharge these fearful communications from the pages of the Book of God. They cannot be criticised away; and if it is "Jesus who saves us from this wrath to come," that is, from those effects of the wrath of God which are to come, then, but for him, we should have been liable to them. That principle in God, from which such effects follow, the Scriptures call wrath; and they who deny the existence of wrath in God, deny, therefore, the Scriptures.

It by no means follows, however, that those who thus bow to inspired authority, must interpret wrath to be a *passion* in God; or, that, though we conclude the awful attribute of his justice to require satisfaction, in order to the forgiveness of the guilty, we afford reason to any to charge us with attributing vengeful affections to the Divine Being. "Our adversaries," says Bishop Stillingfleet, "first make opinions for us, and then show that they are unreasonable. They first suppose that anger in God is to be considered as a passion, and that passion a desire of revenge, and then tell us, that if we do not prove that this desire of revenge can be satisfied by the sufferings of Christ, then we can never prove the doctrine of satisfaction to be true; whereas, we do not mean by God's anger, any such passion, but the just declaration of God's will to punish, upon our provocation of him by our sins; we do not make the design of the satisfaction to be, that God may please himself in revenging the sins of the most guilty upon the innocent person, because we make the design of punishment not to be the satisfaction of anger as a desire of revenge, but to be the vindication of the honour and rights of the offended person by such a way as he himself shall judge satisfactory to the ends of his government." — (pp. 288-90.)

On the divine nature of Christ, as rendering his sufferings infinitely meritorious, we have the following appropriate observations:

'It has been objected by Socinus and his followers, that the dignity of a person adds nothing to the estimation of his sufferings. The common opinion of mankind, in all ages, is, however, a sufficient refutation of this objection; for in proportion to the excellence of the creatures immolated in sacrifice have the value and efficacy of oblations been estimated by all people; which notion, when perverted, made them resort, in some instances, to human sacrifices, in cases of great extremity; and, surely, if the principle of substitution existed in the penal law of any human government, it would be universally felt to make a great difference in the character of the law, whether an honourable or a mean substitute were exacted in place of the guilty; and that it would have greatly changed the character of the act of Zaleucus, the Locrian lawgiver, before mentioned, and placed the estimation in which he held his own laws, and the degree of strictness with which he was determined to uphold them, in a very different light, if, instead of parting with one of his own eyes, in place of the remaining eye of his son, he had ordered the eye of some base slave

or of a malefactor to be plucked out. But without entering into this, the notion will be explicitly refuted, if we turn to the testimony of Holy Writ itself, in which the dignity and divinity of our Lord is so often emphatically referred to as stamping that *value* upon his sacrifice, as giving that *consideration* to his voluntary sufferings on our account, which we usually express by the term of "*his merits*." Acts xx, 28, as God, he is said to have "purchased the church with HIS OWN BLOOD." In Colossians, i, 14, 15, we are said to have "redemption through HIS BLOOD, who is THE IMAGE OF THE INVISIBLE GOD." In 1 Corinthians, ii, 8, "the LORD OF GLORY is said to have been CRUCIFIED." St. Peter emphatically calls the blood of Christ "PRECIOUS BLOOD;" and St. Paul dwells particularly upon this peculiarity, when he contrasts the sacrifice of Christ with those of the law, and when he ascribes that purifying efficacy, which he denies to the blood of bulls and of goats, to the blood of Christ. "How much more shall the BLOOD OF CHRIST, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" By the argument of Socinus, there could be no difference between the blood of animals, shed under the law, as to value and efficacy, and the blood of Christ, which is directly in the teeth of the declaration and argument of the apostle, who also asserts that the *patterns* of things in the heavens were purified by animal sacrifices; "but the heavenly things themselves with BETTER SACRIFICES than these," namely, the oblation of Christ.' (pp. 310-11.)

In the following paragraph, Mr. Watson shows, on the authority of apostolic testimony, the connexion which subsists between the death of Christ and the pardon of sin: a subject on which injurious concessions have sometimes been made:—

'It has been sometimes said by theologians, sufficiently sound in their general views of the doctrine of the atonement, that we know not the *vinculum*, or bond of connexion between the sufferings of Christ and the pardon of sin; and this therefore they place among the mysteries of religion. To me this appears rather to arise from obscure views of the atonement, than from the absence of information on this point in the Scriptures themselves. Mysteries of love and incomprehensible facts are found, it is true, in the incarnation, humiliation, and sufferings of our Lord; but the *vinculum*, or connexion of those sufferings, appears to be matter of express revelation, when it is declared, that the death of Christ was a "demonstration of the righteousness of God," of his righteous character and his just administration, and therefore allowed the honourable exercise of mercy without impeachment of justice, or any repeal or relaxation of his laws. If it be meant, in this allegation of mystery, that it is not discoverable how the death of Christ is as adequate a display of the justice of God, as though offenders had been personally punished, this also is clearly in opposition to what the apostle has said, in the passage which has been so often referred to, "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness," εἰς ἐνδείξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, *for a demonstration, or MANIFESTATION of his righteousness*; nor surely can the particulars before stated, in explanation of this point, be well

weighed, without our perceiving how gloriously the holiness and essential rectitude of God, as well as his rectoral justice, were illustrated by this proceeding; this surely is manifestation, not mystery.'—(pp. 320–21.)

Having established the doctrine of atonement for sin, by the death of Christ, Mr. Watson proceeds next to consider the benefits which are derived to man from that gracious procedure. Among these are specified, justification, and its concomitants, regeneration, adoption, and the witness of the Spirit: all of which are distinctly explained upon scriptural principles. Justification is shown to consist in the forgiveness of sins; and, it is proved, that in the language of Holy Scripture, the terms justification, the non-imputation of sin, the covering of sin, and the imputation of righteousness, are all used to express substantially the same blessing,—absolution from guilt, and acceptance with God. In the chapter on this subject, there is an able refutation of the opinion so strenuously defended by Mr. Hervey, and other divines of the same school, that justification consists in the imputation to the believer of the active obedience of Christ to the moral law: an opinion which, however excellent may be the personal character of some of its adherents, is the very soul of the Antinomian heresy. In this part of his work, our author has judiciously availed himself of the *Treatise on Justification*, by the celebrated John Goodwin, published upwards of a hundred and eighty years ago, and forming, without exception, one of the most acute and powerful pieces of polemic theology that was ever written. Mr. Watson has also furnished a most satisfactory confutation of Bishop Bull's theory, contained in his Latin treatise, entitled *Harmonia Apostolica*: and adopted by a large body of the national clergy. That eminent scholar contends, that sinners are justified before God by faith and works united. To establish this position, he explains St. Paul's doctrine of justification by that of St. James; without adverting to the very obvious circumstance, which at once shows the absurdity of his reasoning, that St. James only introduces the subject of justification *incidentally*, while St. Paul discourses upon it *at large*, and of *set purpose*. The faith by which sinners are justified is shown to have special reference to the sacrifice of Christ, and to be a principle of trust or confidence.

Our author has not gone so largely into the subject of regeneration as we anticipated. He has simply stated its nature, and refuted an opinion which has been somewhat prevalent of late years among a certain class of divines,—That regeneration precedes repentance: an opinion which confounds the effects produced by the preventing grace of God, with that renovation of nature which constitutes a 'meetness for the inheritance of the saints in light.' In reference to these subjects, Mr. Watson says, *Regeneration*

'Is that mighty change in man, wrought by the Holy Spirit, by which the dominion which sin has over him in his natural state, and

which he deplores and struggles against in his penitent state, is broken and abolished ; so that with full choice of will, and the energy of right affections, he serves God freely, and "runs in the way of his commandments." "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." "For sin shall not have dominion over you ; for ye are not under the law, but under grace." "But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life." Deliverance from the bondage of sin, and the power and the will to do all things which are pleasing to God, both as to inward habits and outward acts, are, therefore, the distinctive characters of this state.

That repentance is not regeneration, we have before observed. It will not bear disputing whether regeneration begins with repentance ; for if the regenerate state is only entered upon at our justification, then all that can be meant by this, to be consistent with the Scriptures, is, that the preparatory process, which leads to regeneration, as it leads to pardon, commences with conviction and contrition, and goes on to a repentant turning to the Lord. In the order which God has established, regeneration does not take place without this process. Conviction of the evil and danger of an unregenerate state must first be felt. God hath appointed this change to be effected in answer to our prayers ; and acceptable prayer supposes that we desire the blessing we ask ; that we accept of Christ as the appointed medium of access to God : that we feel and confess our own inability to attain what we ask from another ; and that we exercise faith in the promises of God which convey the good we seek. It is clear that none of these is regeneration, for they all suppose it to be a good in prospect, the object of prayer and eager desire. True it is, that deep and serious conviction of sin, the power to desire deliverance from it, the power to pray, the struggle against the corruptions of an unregenerate heart, are all proofs of a work of God in the heart, and of an important moral change ; but it is not *this* change, because regeneration is that renewal of our nature which gives us dominion over sin, and enables us to serve God from love, and not merely from fear ; and it is yet confessedly unattained, being still the object of search and eager desire. We are not yet "created anew unto good works," which is as special and instant a work of God as justification, and for this reason, that it is not attained before the pardon of our sins, and always accompanies it.

This last point may be proved,

- 1, From the nature of justification itself, which takes away the penalty of sin ; but that penalty is not only obligation to punishment, but the loss of the sanctifying Spirit, and the curse of being left under the slavery of sin, and under the dominion of Satan. Regeneration is effected by this Spirit restored to us, and is a consequence of our pardon ; for though justification in itself is the remission of sin, yet a justified *state* implies a change, both in our condition and in our disposition : in our *condition*, as we are in a state of life, not of death, of safety, not of condemnation ; in our *disposition*, as regenerate and new creatures.

2, From Scripture, which affords us direct proof that regeneration is a concomitant of justification, "If any man be **IN CHRIST**, he is a new creature." It is then the result of our entrance into that state in which we are said to be **IN CHRIST**; and the meaning of this phrase is most satisfactorily explained by Rom. viii, 1, considered in connexion with the preceding chapter, from which, in the division of the chapters, it ought not to have been separated. That chapter clearly describes the state of a person *convinced* and *slain* by the law applied by the **SPIRIT**. We may discover, indeed, in this description, certain moral changes, as consenting to the law that it is good; delighting in it after the inward man; powerful desires; humble confession, &c. The state represented is, however, in fact, one of guilt, spiritual captivity, helplessness, and misery; a state of *condemnation*; and a state of *bondage to sin*. The opposite condition is that of a man "**IN CHRIST JESUS**:" to him "there is no *condemnation*;" he is forgiven; the *bondage to sin is broken*; he "walks not after the flesh, but after the **SPIRIT**." To be **IN CHRIST**, is, therefore, to be justified; and regeneration instantly follows. We see then the order of the Divine operation in individual experience: conviction of sin, helplessness, and danger: faith; justification; and regeneration. The regenerate state is, also, called in Scripture sanctification; though a distinction is made by the apostle Paul between that and being "*sanctified wholly*;" a doctrine to be afterward considered. In this regenerate or sanctified state, the former corruptions of the heart may remain, and strive for the mastery; but that which characterizes and distinguishes it from the state of a penitent before justification, before he is "*in Christ*," is, that they are not even his inward *habit*; and that they have no *dominion*. Faith unites to Christ; by it we "derive grace and peace from God the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ," and enjoy "the communion of the Holy Ghost;" and this Spirit, as the sanctifying Spirit, is given to us to "*abide with us, and to be in us*," and then we walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit.—(pp. 460-62.)

According to the representations of Scripture, until a man has repented of his sin, and believed in Jesus Christ with the heart unto righteousness, he is in a state of guilt and condemnation before God: now to suppose that, while he remains in that state, he is a subject of regenerating grace; that is, that while he is under the sentence of eternal death, he is born of God, made a partaker of the Divine nature, and actually prepared for eternal glory, is a palpable absurdity. Whereas, when any man, under the influence of preventing grace, is brought to the exercise of repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ, his guilt is cancelled, and his person is justified; he stands fully and freely acquitted before God; there is no charge against him; and a way is then opened for the communication of the Holy Spirit to his soul, in all his fulness of regenerating and comforting energy. But never, until we are freed from the guilt of sin, can we justly expect to receive a new nature.

In regard to Adoption, Mr. Watson remarks,—

'To suppose that the apostles take this term from the practice of

the Greeks, Romans, and other nations, who had the custom of adopting the children of others, and investing them with all the privileges of their natural offspring, is, probably, a refinement. It is much more likely, that they had simply in view the obvious fact, that our sins had deprived us of our sonship, the favour of God, and our right to the inheritance of eternal life; that we had become strangers, and aliens, and enemies; and that, upon our return to God, and reconciliation with him, our forfeited privileges were not only restored, but heightened through the paternal love of God. They could scarcely be forgetful of the affecting parable of the prodigal son; and it is under the same simple view, that St. Paul quotes from the Old Testament, "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you, and I will be a father unto you; and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty."

Adoption, then, is that act by which we who were alienated, and enemies, and disinherited, are made the sons of God, and heirs of his eternal glory. "If children then heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ;" where it is to be remarked, that it is not in our own right, nor in right of any work done in us, or which we ourselves do, though it be an evangelical work, that we become heirs, but *jointly with him*, and in his right.

To this state belong freedom from a servile spirit; we are not servants but sons: the special love and care of God our heavenly Father; a filial confidence in him; free access to him at all times and in all circumstances; the title to the heavenly inheritance; and the Spirit of adoption, or the witness of the Holy Spirit to our adoption, which is the foundation of all the comfort we can derive from those privileges, as it is the only means by which we can know that they are ours.—(p. 462.)

The witness of the Spirit mentioned in the apostolical Epistles, and vouchsafed to believers, to assure them of their adoption into the family of God, Mr. Watson shows to be *direct* and *immediate*; and confined not to a few persons, but given as the common privilege of real Christians. The direct testimony of the Spirit is strengthened, and proved to be no delusion, by 'the answer of a good conscience,' which has been denominated, the witness of our own spirit. Of these two witnesses, our author speaks in the following passage:—

'The second testimony is that of our own spirits, "and is a consciousness of our having received in and by the Spirit of adoption, the tempers mentioned in the word of God, as belonging to his adopted children; that we are inwardly conformed by the Spirit of God, to the image of his Son, and that we walk before him in justice, mercy, and truth, doing the things which are pleasing in his sight." But this testimony, let it be observed, is not to the fact of our adoption *directly*, but to the fact that we have, in truth, received the Spirit of adoption, and that we are under no delusive impressions. This will enable us to answer a common objection to the doctrine of the Spirit's direct witness. This is, that when the evidence of a first witness must be

supported by that of a second, before it can be fully relied on, it appears to be by no means of a "decisive and satisfactory character; and that it might be as well to have recourse at once to the evidence, which, after all, seems to sustain the main weight of the cause." The answer to this is not difficult: if it were, it would weigh nothing against an express text of Scripture, which speaks of the witness of the Holy Spirit and the witness of our own spirits. Both must, therefore, be concluded necessary, though we should not see their concomitancy and mutual relation. The case is not, however, involved in entire obscurity. Our own spirits can take no cognizance of the mind of God, as to our actual pardon, and can bear no witness to that fact. The Holy Spirit only, who knows the mind of God, can be this witness; and if the fact, that God is reconciled to us, can only be known to him, by him only can it be attested to us. It cannot, therefore, be "as well for us to have recourse at once to the evidence of our own spirits;" because, as to this fact, our own spirits have no evidence to give. They cannot give *direct* evidence of it; for we know not what passes in the mind of the invisible God: they cannot give *indirect* evidence of the fact; for no moral changes, of which our spirits can be conscious, have been stated in Scripture as the proofs of our pardon; they prove that there is a work of God in our hearts, but they are not proofs of our actual forgiveness. Our own spirits are competent witnesses that such moral effects have been produced in our hearts and character, as it is the office of the Holy Spirit to produce; they prove, therefore, the reality of the presence of the Holy Spirit with us, and in us. That competent and infallible Witness, has borne his testimony that God is become our Father; he has shed abroad his holy comfort, the comfort which arises from the sense of pardon,—and his moral operation within us, accompanying, or immediately following upon this, making us new creatures in Christ Jesus, is the proof that we are in no delusion as to the witness who gives us this testimony being, in truth, the Spirit of God.—(pp. 478–79.)

In concluding our notice of the Fourth Part of Mr. Watson's Institutes, which completes the second volume, we have further to observe, that it displays the same implicit deference to the testimony of Scripture, which distinguishes the former portions of that very able work; and that it contains less quotation than was formerly given, and therefore a larger portion of original composition. Several questions arising out of the subjects discussed, are placed in a light which is new to us, and in which we think they cannot fail to impress the serious and attentive reader. The author fearlessly asserts and defends the truths of Christianity, as they are proposed in all their simplicity in Holy Writ, and shrinks from no difficulty that he meets with in his powerful and triumphant career. The pernicious errors of Socinus, and his disciples, are pursued in their sinuous windings, and exposed in all their atrocity and danger.

Having established the doctrine of atonement for sin by the death of Christ, Mr. Watson is led to an examination of the theories which

limit that atonement to a part only of the human race, and is thus drawn into a discussion of what is usually called the Calvinistic controversy : a subject of immense importance, and of the deepest interest ; and one which has occupied the talents of several of the most accomplished divines that have adorned the Protestant churches of Europe. Happy would it have been if all the writers who have taken a part in this controversy had been as much distinguished by the 'meekness and gentleness of Christ,' as several of them have been by their logical skill, and the tenacity with which they have defended the peculiarities of their creed ! On no subject has more profound learning been displayed ; and perhaps no subject has been discussed with greater animosity, and with less regard for those precepts which enjoin the exercise of kindness and charity.

To one of the folios of Baxter, there is a long and quaint, but most expressive title, which speaks volumes as to the manner in which the Calvinistic controversy was agitated in his day. We give it here, both as a curiosity, and to show how much reason we have for gratitude to God, on account of that improved state of things which we have lived to witness : 'Catholic Theology ; plain, pure, peaceable ; for pacification of the dogmatical word-warriors, who by contending about things unrevealed, or not understood, and by taking verbal differences for real, and their own arbitrary notions for necessary sacred truths, deceived and deceiving by ambiguous unexplained words, have long been the shame of the Christian religion, a scandal and hardening to unbelievers, the incendiaries, dividers, and distracters of the church, the occasion of state discords and wars, the corrupters of Christian faith, and the subverters of their own souls and their followers', calling them to a blind zeal, and wrathful warfare against true piety, love, and peace ; and teaching them to censure, backbite, slander, and prate against each other, for things which they never understood. In three parts, &c, written chiefly for posterity, when sad experience hath taught men to hate theological logical wars, and to love and seek and call for peace.' (Ex bello pax.) Of the author of the elaborate work thus entitled, it has been justly remarked, that 'he has evidently peace, love, and unity, for his *end*, but takes his way to it through a perplexing wood of thorns and briars.'

Both the genius and the times of Baxter united to persuade him that there was no other way to that desirable result. We have the felicity of seeing the generation of 'word-warriors' nearly extinct : almost all persons now seem agreed, 'to love and seek and call for peace.' An end has been put to those subtle and angry conflicts which served only to widen the breach between the opposing parties, to exasperate their spirits, and to cut off all hope of an amicable adjustment of their differences. We no longer see men frowning defiance against each other, through the checquered and deceptive openings of a tangled and bristling thicket of metaphysical sophisms and quibbles. They have come forth, as by mutual consent, into

the clear champaign spread before them by common sense and Scripture testimony; where they have discovered, that they are not pledged to eternal enmity, but are brethren in Christ; and that they are already agreed on too many points of the highest importance, not to feel anxious to cultivate a more friendly intercourse with each other. Thus, by a process much more simple and direct than the one contemplated and prepared in the learned lucubrations of Baxter, we are gradually lessening the number of our discrepancies, and drawing nearer to a unity of faith in all essential truths.

This mode of proceeding is far more likely to succeed than the most skilful management of the war of words, or even the most masterly and acute investigations and arguments. Temperate and candid discussion, in which our object is to ascertain the real meaning of the word of God, cannot fail to elicit truth, and, ultimately, to secure unity of sentiment. That word was certainly not thrown into our world as an apple of discord, but graciously given to us as a bond of union. Sound Protestants neither can wish it out of the way, for the sake of peace; nor do they sigh for any infallible interpreter to fix its meaning for them. As it is manifestly the will of God, so it is no doubt best, that every man should exercise his own mind and judgment in the examination of its contents; and if he should even mistake its meaning in a hundred instances of less importance, the study will do him more good, and put him in possession of more truth, than he could ever attain by merely obeying the *ipse dixit* of any human teacher. Even the Apostles themselves were not sent forth merely to dictate. They reasoned and manifested the truth, and made their disciples the judges of what they said; and those who were the most diligent in exercising that manly right, in a legitimate way,—that is, in searching the Scriptures of the Old Testament, to see ‘whether these things were so,’—are the most highly commended. We have no fears as to the result of a universal circulation of the Scriptures without note or comment, and of the most free discussions of their contents by men of all ranks and characters. For although individuals may pervert them, and infidels may contradict and blaspheme their doctrines; when once the Holy Spirit of truth and love shall cause the plastic energy of that great instrument of the world’s renovation fully to act on the whole mass of human intellect and moral agency, light shall arise out of darkness, order shall spring from confusion, and all the beauty of holiness shall beam forth from every part of the new creation. Let ‘the law of the Lord’ put forth its own proper authority, and it will be seen to be ‘perfect, converting the soul;’ let ‘the testimony of the Lord’ be received, and it will be found to be ‘sure, making wise the simple;’ let ‘the statutes of the Lord’ be examined, and they will be proved to be ‘right, rejoicing the heart;’ let ‘the commandment of the Lord’ be obeyed, and it will be discovered to be clear, ‘enlightening the eyes:’ while the whole will

generate a pure 'fear,' 'enduring for ever;' and an acknowledgment that 'the judgments of the Lord are true, and righteous altogether.'

Independent of the direct operation of those noble and truly catholic institutions, whose object is to give the pure word of God to all men in the languages intelligible to them respectively, they have done much, indirectly, to impress upon the minds of all, who have in any way engaged to carry their plans into effect, a deep and operative conviction of the sufficiency of the Scriptures to make men wise to salvation, if they will read them with proper attention. This, we are persuaded, has been one very principal cause of the peace and harmony which at present increasingly prevail among us. Hence our every day theology has assumed a character, both as to its sentiments and language, much more free from party distinctions than that of former times.—This is a pleasing proof of a more general effusion of the Holy Ghost upon the faithful; and an earnest of that most desirable state of the church, when all her children shall be so fully 'taught of the Lord,' as to be led to speak the same thing; and when there shall be no more divisions among them, but all shall be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment.

At a time when nearly all our theological wars have died away, and the activities of Christian benevolence will scarcely allow us time to reflect on our remaining differences of opinion, we feel reluctant to do any thing that would revive the recollection of the tumults formerly excited by the bitter disputes which were maintained, and that to so little purpose, on 'the five points.' But, as every man who thinks upon them, (and who can or ought to avoid it?) must take a side,—for perfect neutrality is here impossible, and the affectation of it is the mere imbecility of folly,—all that we can do, when they come in our way, is, to keep our spirits perfectly calm; and, on their own proper merits, to discuss them with candour. In treating of the doctrines of Christianity, in a work like that before us, the author was necessarily led to a consideration of the Quinquarticular Controversy; and as four out of the five chapters of that portion of his work at present under our notice relate to that controversy, it becomes our duty to follow him into it, and to give our honest judgment of the manner in which he has conducted the investigation.

There cannot be a more important question than that which relates to the extent of the atonement made by the death of Christ. It is a question which *will* force itself upon the attention of every man who is at all concerned about his future state of being. As there is no other medium of salvation for guilty man, he cannot but be anxious to know whether that medium is open for all, or only for a part of the human race. Mr. Watson thinks that it is open for all who will avail themselves of it, and that all *may* do so. This he attempts to prove from Divine revelation,—the only ground on

which it can be fairly argued. Without going formally into all the points which have been debated in connexion with this question, he notices every thing that can be deemed at all material. Those who cannot agree with him in all his conclusions, must admire the candour and liberality with which he conducts the argument; and these qualities cannot but secure him an attentive hearing from all those, at least, who are equally candid and liberal. The following extract gives a very correct view of the spirit in which the whole is written:—

‘We have, in the foregoing attempt to establish the doctrine of the redemption of all mankind against our Calvinistic brethren, taken their scheme in the sense in which it is usually understood, without noticing those minuter shades with which the system has been varied. In this discussion it is hoped that no expression has hitherto escaped inconsistent with candour. Doctrinal truth would be as little served by this as Christian charity; nor ought it ever to be forgotten by the theological inquirer, that the system which we have brought under review has, in some of its branches, always embodied, and often preserved in various parts of Christendom, that truth which is vital to the church, and salutary to the souls of men. It has numbered, too, among its votaries, many venerable names; and many devoted and holy men, whose writings often rank among the brightest lights of scriptural criticism and practical divinity. We think the *peculiarities* of their creed clearly opposed to the sense of Scripture, and fairly chargeable *in argument* with all those consequences we have deduced from them; and which, were it necessary to the discussion, might be characterized in still stronger language. Those consequences, however, let it be observed, we only exhibit as *logical* ones. By many of this class of divines they are denied; by others modified; and by a third party explained away to their own satisfaction, by means of metaphysical and subtle distinctions. As logical consequences only they are, therefore, in such cases, fairly to be charged upon our opponents, in any disputes which may arise. By keeping this distinction in view, the discussion of these points may be preserved unfettered; and candour and charity sustain no wound.’—(pp. 107–8.)

Mr. Watson first attempts to prove that Christ died for all men, from those passages of Scripture which expressly assert the fact, and speak of his death as an atonement for the sins of the whole world. He then argues the same point from those passages which attribute an equal extent to the effects of the death of Christ, and of the fall of our first parents. He also assumes, that the same important truth is necessarily implied, (1.) In all those passages which declare that Christ died, not only for those that are saved, but also for those that do or may perish: (2.) In all those which make it the duty of men to believe the Gospel, and place them under the guilt and penalty of death for rejecting it: (3.) In all those in which men’s failure in the business of salvation is placed to the account of their own opposing wills, and made wholly their own fault. The evidence of these several classes of texts is urged

with great effect ; and much skill in illustration is displayed in the removal of the false glosses by which it has been attempted to break their force, and to reconcile them with the doctrine of partial redemption. We think it must be allowed by candid Calvinists themselves, that meanings the most forced and unnatural are often put upon such texts, and meanings which would never have been thought of, had it not been judged absolutely necessary to preserve the consistency of the sense of Scripture. Of course, the writers who invented those strange modes of interpretation thought that they were required by doctrines which were conceived to be expressly taught in other parts of the Book of God. But we ought to be well assured of the ground on which we stand, before we presume to take such liberties with the words of the Almighty. 'Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.'

In the next chapter, in which the same subject is continued, Mr. Watson goes on to examine those inferential interpretations of Scripture which limit, to the elect only, not merely the actual, but the intentional efficacy of the death of Christ. On entering upon this part of his argument, he remarks :—

'We reserve it to another place to state the *systematic* views which the followers of Calvin, in their different shades of opinion, take of the doctrines of election, &c, lest our more simple inquiry into the sense of Scripture should be disturbed by extraneous topics ; and we are now, therefore, merely called to consider, how far this argument, which is professedly drawn from Scripture, and not from metaphysical principles, is supported or refuted, by an examination of those portions of Holy Writ on which it is usually built ; and it will not prove a difficult task to show, that, when fairly interpreted, they contain nothing which obliges us to narrow our interpretation of those passages which extend the benefit of the death of Christ to all mankind : and that, in some views, they strongly corroborate their most extended meaning.'—(p. 28.)

He then observes, that there are three kinds of election mentioned in Scripture : First, That of individuals to perform some special work or service, as of Cyrus to rebuild the temple, Paul to be the Apostle of the Gentiles, &c. Secondly, that of nations, or bodies of men, to eminent religious privileges ; and, in order to accomplish, by their superior illumination, the merciful purposes of God, in benefiting other nations or bodies of people ; as the Jews, for instance. Lastly, that of individuals to eternal life. As it respects the first of these particulars, there can be little or no difference of opinion, and therefore it is very properly dismissed with a few remarks. The two latter are considered at large. We are sorry that we cannot find room for a complete analysis of this part of the work. It is particularly interesting and important. The illustrations of Scripture are most happy and satisfactory ; and what is written on the three celebrated chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, upon

which so much stress has often been laid by the followers of Calvin, is especially deserving of attention, as a most luminous and convincing exposition. We had very much wished to insert in our work what Mr. Watson has said of the potter and the clay, as remarkably appropriate; but we find the passage is too long for a review, and we cannot reduce it without injury to the whole. We must, of necessity, therefore, refer to the work itself, in which we venture to say, that our readers will find what will amply reward them for their labour in the perusal. They will find that it is clearly proved, according to the manifest intention of the Apostle, in the discourse in question, that the proceedings of God towards the Jews shut out all reply and debate with God. There was no injustice in his casting off from being any longer his peculiar people those who refused submission to the Redeemer, and set up their own erroneous and absurd notions in opposition to the wisdom and will of God. Yet he even endured with much long-suffering these 'vessels of wrath fitted to destruction,' and gave them repeated opportunities of coming into the Christian church, and of enjoying all her privileges, in common with the believing Gentiles. We give the following as a small specimen of the author's manner and views in this part of his argument:—

'We come, finally, to the case of the rejected Jews, in the very age of the Apostles. The purpose of God, as we have seen, was to abolish the former ground, on which his visible church had for so many ages been built, that of natural descent from Abraham by Isaac and Jacob; but this was so far from shutting out the Jews from spiritual blessings, that though, *as Jews*, they were now denied to be God's church, yet they were all invited to come in with the Gentiles, or rather to lead the way into the new church, established on the new principle of faith in Jesus, as the Christ. Hence the Apostles were commanded to "begin at Jerusalem" to preach the Gospel; hence they made the Jews the first offer in every place in Asia Minor, and other parts of the Roman Empire, into which they travelled on the same blessed errand. Many of the Jews accepted the call, entered into the church-state on the new principle on which the church of Christ was now to be *elected*, and hence they are called by St. Paul, "the *remnant* according to the election of grace," Rom. xi, 5, and "*the election*." The rest, it is true, are said to have been "blinded;" just in the same sense as Pharaoh was hardened. He hardened his own heart, and was judicially left to his obduracy; they blinded themselves by their prejudices and worldliness and spiritual pride, and were, at length, judicially given up to blindness. But then might they not all have had a share in this new election into this new church of God? Truly, every one of them; for thus the Apostle argues, Rom. ix, 30, 32: "What shall we say then? That the Gentiles which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith; but Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness. *Wherefore?* BECAUSE THEY SOUGHT IT NOT BY FAITH; but, as it were, by

the works of the law." And thus we have it plainly declared, that they were excluded from the new spiritual church of God, not by any act of sovereignty, not by any decree of reprobation, but by an act of their own: they rejected the doctrine and way of faith; they attained not unto righteousness, *because* they sought it not by faith.

The collective election and rejection taught in this chapter, is not then unconditional, in the sense of the Calvinists; and neither the salvation of the people elected, nor the condemnation of the people rejected, flows as necessary consequents from these acts of the Divine sovereignty. They are, indeed, mysterious procedures; for doubtless it must be allowed that they place some portions of men in circumstances more favoured than others; but, even in such cases, God has shut out the charge of "*unrighteousness*," by requiring from men according "to what they have, and not according to what they have not;" as we learn from many parts of Scripture which reveal the *principles* of the Divine administration, both as to this life and another: for no man is shut out from the mercy of God, but by his own fault. He has connected these events also with *wise and gracious general plans*, as to the human race. They are not acts of arbitrary will, or of caprice; they are acts of "wisdom and knowledge," the mysterious bearings of which are to be in future times developed. "O the depth, both of the *wisdom* and *knowledge* of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!" These are the devout expressions with which St. Paul concludes this discourse; but they would ill apply to the sovereign, arbitrary, and unconditional reprobation of men from God's mercies in time and eternity, on the principle of taking some and leaving others without any reason in themselves. There is no *plan* in this; no wisdom; no mystery; and it is capable of no further development for the instruction and benefit of the world; for that which rests originally on no reason but solely on arbitrary will, is incapable, from its very nature, of becoming the component part of a deeply laid, and, for a time, mysterious *plan*, which is to be brightened into manifest wisdom, and to terminate in the good of mankind, and the glory of God.'—(pp. 51–2.)

The next chapter contains an examination of certain passages of Scripture, supposed to limit the extent of Christ's Redemption. The following extract may serve to show the manner in which the examination is conducted:—

'Acts xviii, 9, 10, "Be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace; for I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee; for *I have much people in this city.*"

Mr. Scott, to whom the doctrine of election is always present, says, "In this Christ *evidently* spake of those who were *his* by election, the gift of the Father, and his own purchase; though at that time in an unconverted state." It would have been more "evident," had this been *said* by the writer of the Acts as well as by Mr. Scott, or any thing approaching to it. The "evidence," we fear, was all in Mr. Scott's predisposition of mind; for it no where else appears. The expression is, at least, capable of two very satisfactory interpretations, independent of the theory of Calvinistic election. It may mean,

that there were many well disposed and serious inquirers amongst the "Greeks" in Corinth; for when Paul turned from the Jews, he "entered into the house of Justus, one *that worshipped God*." This man was a Greek proselyte; and, from various parts of the Acts of the Apostles it is plain, that this class of people were not only numerous, but generally received the Gospel with joy, and were among the first who joined the primitive churches. They manifested their readiness to receive the Gospel in Corinth itself, when the Jews "opposed and blasphemed;" and it is not improbable, that to such proselytes, who were in many places "a people prepared of the Lord," reference is made, when our Saviour, speaking to Paul in this vision, says, "I have much people in this city." Suppose, however, he speaks prospectively and prophetically, making his foreknowledge of an event the means of encouraging the labours of his devoted Apostle, the doctrine of election follows neither from the fact of the foreknowledge of God, nor from prophetic declarations grounded upon it. Even Calvin founds not election upon God's foreknowledge; but upon his decree.' (pp. 106-7.)

The author then proceeds to a consideration of the theories which limit the extent of the death of Christ. In the first place, he shows that nothing in the preceding discussion has been assumed as Calvinism, but what is to be met with in the writings of the founder of the system, and in the confessions and creeds of churches which professedly admitted his doctrine. Our author next takes a view of the modifications of the system, and gives a large and particular account of that of Baxter. This chapter is especially deserving of notice, both as containing the strongest reasons against the doctrine of a limited redemption, and as tending to show the utter folly of attempting to find a mean where none exists; or of seeking to reconcile that which is manifestly irreconcilable. Mr. Watson concludes this part of his argument with the following energetic paraphrase:—

'The theory to which the name of Baxter has given some weight in this country, has been introduced more at length, because with it stands or falls every system of moderated or modified Calvinism, which by more modern writers has been advocated. The scheme of Dr. Williams, of Rotherham, is little beside the old theory of supralapsarian reprobation, in its twofold enunciation of **PRETERITION**, by which God refuses help to a creature which cannot stand without help, and his consequent **DAMNATION** for the crimes committed in consequence of this withholding of supernatural aid. The dress is altered, and the system has a *dash* of Cameronism, but it is in substance the same. All other mitigated schemes rest on two principles, the sufficiency of the atonement for all mankind, and the sufficiency of grace to those who believe not. For the first, it is enough to say, that the Synod of Dort, and the higher Calvinistic school, will agree with them upon this point, and so nothing is gained; for the second, that the sufficiency of grace in these schemes is always understood in Baxter's sense, and is mere verbiage. It is not "the grace of God WHICH BRINGETH SALVATION;" for no man is actually saved without something more than this "suffi-

cient grace" provides. That which is contended for, is, in fact, not a sufficiency of grace in order to salvation; but, in order to justify the condemnation which inevitably follows. For this alone the struggle is made, but without success. The main characteristic of all these theories, from the first to the last, from the highest to the lowest, is, that a part of mankind is shut out from the mercies of God, on some ground irrespective of their refusal of a sincere offer to them of salvation through Christ, made with a communicated power of embracing it. Some power they allow to the reprobate, as natural power, and degrees of superadded moral power; but in no case the power to believe unto salvation; and thus, as one well observes, "when they have cut some fair trenches, as if they would bring the water of life unto the dwellings of the reprobate, on a sudden they open a sluice, which carries it off again." The whole labour of these theories is to find out some decent pretext for the infliction of punishment on them that perish, independent of the only reason given by Scripture, their rejection of a mercy free for all.—(pp. 151-2.)

This is followed by an inquiry into the probable origin of the Calvinistic system, which our author thinks arose from metaphysical hypotheses, and school subtleties, to which the sense of Scripture has been accommodated. Those who may demur to this opinion, will do well to read over, with candour, what he has written in reference to the assumptions on which that system chiefly rests, concerning the will of man, eternal decrees, Divine pre-science, and sovereignty.

The following extract will be read with interest, independent of the particular controversy with which it stands connected:—

'The case of HEATHEN NATIONS has sometimes been referred to by Calvinists, as presenting equal difficulties to those urged against their scheme of election and reprobation. But the cases are not at all parallel, nor can they be made so, unless it could be proved that Heathens, *as such*, are inevitably excluded from the kingdom of heaven; which is not, as some of them seem to suppose, a conceded point. Those, indeed, if there be any such, who, believing in the universal redemption of mankind, should allow this, would be most inconsistent with themselves, and give up many of those principles on which they successfully contend against the doctrine of absolute reprobation; but the argument lies in small compass, and is to be determined by the Word of God, and not by the speculations of men. The actual state of pagan nations is affectingly bad; but nothing can be deduced, from what they are in fact, against their salvability; for, although there is no ground to hope for the salvation of great numbers of them, actual salvation is one thing, and possible salvation is another. Nor does it affect this question, if we see not *how* Heathens may be saved; that is, by what means repentance, and faith, and righteousness should be in any such degree wrought in them, as that they shall become acceptable to God. The dispensation of religion under which all those nations are to whom the Gospel has never been sent, continues to be the patriarchal dispensation. That men were saved under that in former times we know, and at what point, if any, a religion becomes

so far corrupted, and truth so far extinct, as to leave no means of salvation to men, nothing to call forth a true faith *in principle*, and obedience to what remains known or knowable of the original law, no one has the right to determine, unless he can adduce some authority from Scripture. That authority is certainly not available to the conclusion, that, in point of fact, the means of salvation are utterly withdrawn from Heathens. We may say that a murderous, adulterous, and idolatrous Heathen will be shut out from the kingdom of heaven; we must say this, on the express exclusion of all such characters from future blessedness by the word of God; but it would be little to the purpose to say, that, as far as we know, all of them are wicked and idolatrous. As far as *we* know they may, but we do not know the whole case; and were these charges universally true, yet the question is not what the Heathen are, but what they have the means of becoming. We indeed know that all are not equally vicious, nay, that some virtuous Heathens have been found in all ages; and some earnest and anxious inquirers after truth, dissatisfied with the notions prevalent in their own countries respectively; and what these few were, the rest might have been likewise. But, if we knew no such instances of superior virtue and eager desire of religious information among them, the true question, "What degree of truth is, after all, attainable by them?" would still remain a question which must be determined not so much by our knowledge of facts which may be very obscure, but such principles and general declarations as we find applicable to the case in the word of God.

If all knowledge of right and wrong, and all gracious influence of the Holy Spirit, and all objects of faith, have passed away from the Heathen, through the fault of their ancestors "not liking to retain God in their knowledge," and without the present race having been parties to this wilful abandonment of truth, then they would appear no longer to be accountable creatures, being neither under the *law* nor under *grace*; but as we find it a doctrine of Scripture, that all men are responsible to God, and that the "whole world" will be judged at the last day, we are bound to admit the accountability of all, and with that, the remains of law and the existence of a merciful government towards the Heathen on the part of God. With this the doctrine of St. Paul accords. No one can take stronger views of the actual danger and the corrupt state of the Gentiles than he; yet he affirms that the Divine law had not perished wholly from among them: that though they had received no revealed law, yet they had a law "written on their hearts;" meaning, no doubt, the traditionary law, the equity of which their consciences attested; and, further, that though they had not the written law, yet, that "by nature," that is, "without an outward rule, though this, also, strictly speaking, is by preventing grace," they were capable of doing all the things contained in the law. He affirms, too, that all such Gentiles as were thus obedient, should be "justified, in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to his Gospel." The possible obedience and the possible "justification" of Heathens who have no written revelation, are points, therefore, distinctly affirmed by the apostle in his discourse, in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Romans; and the

whole matter of God's sovereignty, as to the Heathen, is reduced, not to the leaving of any portion of our race without the means of salvation, and then punishing them for sins which they have no means of avoiding; but to the fact of his having given superior advantages to us, and inferior ones only to them; a proceeding which we see exemplified in the most enlightened of Christian nations every day, for neither every part of the same nation is equally favoured with the means of grace, nor are all the families living in the same town and neighbourhood equally circumstanced as to means of religious influence and improvement. The principle of this inequality is, however, far different from that on which Calvinistic reprobation is sustained; since it involves no inevitable exclusion of any individual from the kingdom of God, and because the general principle of God's administration, in such cases, is elsewhere laid down to be, the requiring of much where much is given, and the requiring of little where little is given:—a principle of the strictest equity.'—(pp. 177–9.)

These views of a subject confessedly difficult, we think incomparably more sober, and more consistent with the Scriptures and the attributes of God, than the notion, that all the Heathen, as such, are necessarily and unavoidably damned: a sentiment which has been distinctly avowed by rigid Supralapsarians, and most inconsistently and incautiously countenanced by some individuals professing to believe the doctrine of general redemption. There is nothing in the tenet of absolute reprobation more revolting, than the opinion of the unavoidable damnation of all the Heathen; and surely such a position is not necessary to stimulate to missionary exertions. The express command of Jesus Christ, that the Gospel should be preached to every creature; and the affecting fact, that the great mass of the Heathen pass through life into the eternal world destitute of that holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord; are sufficient motives to the most strenuous efforts to evangelize all nations, without having recourse to a principle which leads to the conclusion, that either a large proportion of mankind are not in a state of probation, or that the Judge of all the earth is unmerciful and unjust.

This part of Mr. Watson's work contains another chapter, which concludes his view of the Doctrines of Christianity, and embraces a notice of some further benefits of Redemption. The remarks which are here introduced, on the subject of the entire sanctification of believers, are particularly valuable and important.

The principal subject of which it treats has been largely discussed by Arminius, Episcopius, Corvinus, Grotius, and others, in Holland; and by Hoard, Goodwin, Pierce, Womack, Cudworth, Barrow, Whitby, Fletcher, Wesley, Sellon, &c, in England; and hence an ordinary writer would only have been able to condense their arguments, and apply them to the somewhat novel modifications which the Calvinistic system has assumed in modern times. But Mr. Watson has borrowed very little from any of those eminent men. He has evidently thought for himself; and it appears

to us, that this part of his Institutes is distinguished by greater originality than any preceding portion of his work. His argumentation, his elucidations of Scripture, which are equally clear and forcible, are altogether his own; and the manner in which he has conducted the discussion is worthy of the highest praise. His appeal is made exclusively to the Inspired Records, understood in their popular and obvious sense, and explained by parallel texts; and a spirit of candour and benevolence is uniformly displayed. The advocates of General Redemption will rejoice to see their sentiments so ably defended; and those readers whose creed is opposed, we think will be constrained to acknowledge the writer's fairness and ability.

Having proved the Divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, and shown from them what God hath declared concerning his own nature and the mode of his existence, together with the gracious provision which he has made for the salvation of fallen man, Mr. Watson proceeds to speak of the morals and institutions of Christianity. He begins by some general observations on the moral law; and then describes, in detail, the duties which men owe to God and to one another. Among the former class of duties are, submission to God, love to him, trust, fear, prayer, praise, thanksgiving, and the religious observance of the sabbath; and, among the latter, universal charity and justice. Under the heads of charity and justice are included benevolent attempts to promote the welfare of mankind, the careful avoidance of all oppression and wrong, and the reciprocal duties of husbands and wives, parents and children, masters and servants. In the discussion of these subjects, the abstract speculations of what is called moral philosophy are generally avoided, and absolute deference is paid to the decisions of inspiration. The defective reasonings of Paley, and of some other writers of the same class, are also occasionally exposed.

On the active expression of that universal charity which is enjoined upon Christians in the New Testament, Mr. Watson justly and beautifully observes, that

‘It is not a merely negative affection; but it brings forth rich and varied fruits. It produces a feeling of *delight* in the happiness of others, and thus destroys envy; it is the source of *sympathy* and *compassion*; it opens the hand in *liberality* for the supply of the wants of others; it gives *cheerfulness* to every service undertaken in the cause of others; it resists the wrong which may be inflicted upon them; and it will run hazards of health and life for their sakes. It has special respect to the *spiritual interests and salvation* of men; and thus it instructs, persuades, reproves the ignorant and vicious; counsels the simple; comforts the doubting and perplexed; and rejoices in those gifts and graces of others, by which society may be enlightened and purified. The zeal of apostles, the patience of martyrs, the travels and labours of evangelists, in the first ages, were all animated by this affection; and the earnestness of preachers, in all ages, and the

more private labours of Christians for the benefit of the souls of men, with the operations of those voluntary associations which send forth missionaries to the Heathen, or distribute Bibles and tracts, or conduct schools, are all its visible expressions before the world. A principle of philanthropy may be conceived to exist independent of the influence of active and efficient Christianity; but it has always expended itself either in good wishes, or, at most, in feeble efforts, chiefly directed to the mitigation of a little temporary external evil. Except in connexion with religion, and that the religion of the heart, wrought and maintained there by the acknowledged influences of the Holy Spirit, the love of mankind has never exhibited itself under such views and acts as those we have just referred to. It has never been found in characters *naturally* selfish and obdurate; has never disposed men to make great and painful sacrifices for others; never sympathized with spiritual wretchedness; never been called forth into its highest exercises by considerations drawn from the immortal relations of man to eternity; never originated large plans for the illumination and moral culture of society; never fixed upon the grand object to which it is now bending the hearts, the interests, and hopes of the universal church, the conversion of the world. Philanthropy, in systems of mere ethics, like their love of God, is a greatly *inferior* principle to that which is enjoined by Christianity, and infused by its influence;—another proof of the folly of separating morals from revealed truth, and of the necessity of cultivating them upon evangelical principles.’—(pp. 267–8.)

[Mr. Watson's remarks on the difficult and embarrassing subject of slavery, have a special reference to the extensive scale on which this 'terrible evil' exists in the British Colonies, and to the duties of the imperial parliament on the subject. We most heartily wish they had no adaptation to the state of things in our own favored and happy land. Yet, as our government is wholly unconnected with any church establishment, and sustains, moreover, a relation to the several states of the Union very different from that of Great Britain to her colonies, the quotations of the English reviewer from this part of Mr. Watson's work, are here omitted. On the reciprocal duties of masters and servants, Mr. Watson's observations are excellent; and we fully concur with the English reviewer, that 'were they generally exemplified in practice, they would effectually tend to secure domestic tranquillity, and greatly conduce to the prosperity of the Christian cause.' By 'servants,' however, it must be recollected, that it is not merely slaves that are meant, but all those who are connected with our households, in any capacity, either as hired servants or apprentices. As regards slaves we regret to be obliged to say, that the teaching of this class of servants 'to read,' is, we believe, in a few of the states, prohibited by law. We are fully persuaded, however, that this prohibition is not grounded on an unwillingness in any slave-holding state, that the slaves should be instructed in the principles of Christianity. On the contrary, among slaveholders themselves, in this country, so far as our knowledge and observations have extended, it is deemed not only highly

disreputable, but highly impolitic, on the score of interest itself, to deprive this class of servants of this privilege; for Christianity is confessedly calculated to make better servants, as well as better masters. Indeed, this very prohibition, in a few of the states, of teaching slaves to read, increases the obligation of masters to provide for them personal instruction, and opportunities of at least *hearing* the holy Scriptures read and expounded in domestic worship, and also by stated religious teachers. Those who neglect this incur a fearful responsibility, and much more those, if such monsters there can be, who oppose and throw any obstructions in its way. That a respectable portion of the most intelligent and extensive slaveholders are awakening more and more, both to their obligations and to their interest in this respect, is evident from the pleasing fact, that gentlemen of this class in South Carolina, where the slaves are most numerous, and the laws the most strict, have not only invited us to send missionaries on to their estates, for the purpose of instructing their slaves in religion, but also contribute liberally to their support, and afford them every facility for the discharge of this important and sacred duty. The missions to the blacks on the Santee, Pee-Dee, and Ashley rivers, now constitute a part of our regular and most interesting missionary work, and a part, too, which we cannot but think entitled to our favorable attention and regard, not less than that which has for its object the aboriginal tribes of our forests. Who knows but that these missions are the preparatory nurseries, in the order of an inscrutable Providence, for the future civilization and evangelization of Africa? Already it occasionally occurs, that whole families of slaves are emancipated in the south, by deed or will, on condition of their emigration to Africa. Among these, there are here and there pious individuals, who may be destined to be the salt of that earth, and the light of that world. In the infant colony at Liberia, there are now several Christian churches, and among them one of our own denomination. Here the good seed of the kingdom has already been begun to be scattered, and colored preachers, exhorters, and leaders, raised up and instructed among ourselves, carry out to Africa the same gospel. And is not this process to go on, and to spread and increase more and more as at the first rise of Methodism, (but another term for vital and practical Christianity,) in America, till all Africa as all America, shall hear the joyful sound? And as the colony shall improve in population, and strength, and resources, and comforts, will not emancipated slaves be more willing to go thither, and masters be more willing to liberate and send them? Under the operation of all these moral influences combined, may not God, in his great goodness, be working out the salvation, political and religious, both of Africa and America? And in this way may not the fairest opportunity be offered, of repaying, as far as possible, our debt to Africa?]

‘The *religious* duties of masters, [says Mr. Watson,] are also of great importance.

Under the Old Testament the servants of a house partook of the common benefit of the true religion, as appears from the case of the servants of Abraham, who were all brought into the covenant of circumcision; and from the early prohibition of idolatrous practices in families, and, consequently, the maintenance of the common worship of God. The same consecration of whole families to God we see in the New Testament; in the baptism of "houses," and the existence of domestic churches. The practice of inculcating the true religion upon servants, passed from the Jews to the first Christians, and followed indeed from the conscientious employment of the master's *influence* in favour of piety.

From all this arises the duty of instructing servants in the principles of religion; of teaching them to read, and furnishing them with the Scriptures; of having them present at family worship; and of conversing with them faithfully and affectionately respecting their best interests. In particular, it is to be observed, that servants have by the law of God a right to the sabbath, of which no man can, without sin, deprive them. They are entitled under that law to rest on that day; and that not only for the recreation of their strength and spirits, but, especially, to enable them to attend public worship, and to read the Scriptures, and pray in private. Against this duty all those offend who employ servants in works of gain; and also those who do not so arrange the affairs of their households, that domestic servants may be as little occupied as possible with the affairs of the house, in order that they may be able religiously to use a day which is made as much theirs as their masters', by the express letter of the law of God; nor can the blessing of God be expected to rest upon families where this shocking indifference to the religious interests of domestics, and this open disregard of the Divine command, prevail. A Jewish strictness in some particulars is not bound upon Christians: as, for example, the prohibition against lighting fires. These were parts of the municipal, not the moral law of the Jews; and they have respect to a people living in a certain climate, and in peculiar circumstances. But even these prohibitions are of use, as teaching us self denial, and that in all cases we ought to keep within the rules of necessity. Unnecessary occupations are clearly forbidden even when they do not come under the description of *work* for gain; and when they are avoided, there will be sufficient leisure for every part of a family to enjoy the sabbath as a day of rest, and as a day of undistracted devotion. We may here also advert to that heavy national offence which still hangs upon us, the denying of the great majority of our bond slaves in the West Indies those sabbath rights which are secured to them by the very religion we profess. Neither as a day of *rest*, nor as a day of *worship*, is this sacred day granted to them; and for this our insolent and contemptuous defiance of God's holy law, we must be held accountable. This is a consideration which ought to induce that part of the community who retain any fear of God, to be unwearied in their applications to the legislature until this great reproach, this weight of offence against religion and humanity, shall be taken away from us.

The employment of *influence* for the benefit of servants, forms another part of the duty of every Christian master. This appears to

be obligatory upon the general principle, that every thing which can be used by us to promote the will of God, and to benefit others, is a "talent" committed to us, which we are required by our Lord to "occupy." It is greatly to be feared that this duty is much neglected among professedly religious masters; that even domestic servants are suffered to live in a state of spiritual danger, without any means being regularly and affectionately used to bring them to the practical knowledge of the truth; means which, if used with judgment and perseverance, and enforced by the natural influence of a superior, might prove in many instances both corrective and saving. But if this duty be much neglected in households, it is much more disregarded as to that class of servants who are employed as day labourers by the farmer, as journeymen by the master artisan, and as workmen by the manufacturer. More or less the master comes into immediate connexion with this class of servants; and although they are not so directly under his control as those of his household, nor within reach of the same instruction, yet is he bound to discountenance vice among them; to recommend their attendance on public worship; to see that their children are sent to schools; to provide religious help for them when sick; to prefer sober and religious men to others; and to pay them their wages in due time for market, and so early on the Saturday, or on the Friday, that their families may not be obstructed in their preparations for attending the house of God on the Lord's day morning. If the religious character and bias of the master were thus *felt* by his whole establishment, and a due regard paid uniformly to justice and benevolence in the treatment of all in his employ, not only would great moral good be the result, but there would be reason to hope that the relation between employers and their workmen, which in consequence of frequent disputes respecting wages and combinations, has been rendered suspicious and vexatious, would assume a character of mutual confidence and reciprocal good will.'—(pp. 302-4.)

[It has been stated in one of the public journals of this city, on the authority of Jamaica papers, that 'much excitement appears to prevail against the Methodist and Baptist missionaries, particularly the former. The most coarse and abusive language is used in regard to them.'

This is nothing new to us, and we rejoice that 'Methodists' have the glory of being 'especially' marked in this reproach. We know, at the same time, that it is the fixed principle, and the constant charge of the London Wesleyan Missionary Society, that the sacred duty of every missionary to the West Indies is, '*to apply himself to his spiritual work, and to that alone.*' Our principle, in all our missions among slaves in this country, is the same. In reference to the persecution of the Methodist missionaries in Jamaica, we are happy to be able to give the following lucid exposition of it, extracted from an eloquent speech of the Rev. Richard Watson, at the missionary anniversary, in London, in May last:

'An allusion, [said Mr. Watson,] is made in this resolution to the persecutions in Jamaica, and to the missionaries who have been incarcerated there. We have one emaciated missionary on this platform;

and, I rather think, another, who had the honour of being imprisoned a great many years ago; and how many missionaries have we had imprisoned in Jamaica? I have in my hand a list of them; there was Campbell, and Williams, and Wiggins, and Grimsdall, and Whitehouse, and Orton, and all this from Christians! all this from men whose slaves we have been instructing, and who are indebted to us for their improvement in temperance and honesty; all this from men who owe to the exertions of this society more than they can ever repay; and what has been their conduct in return for all this? They have of late enacted a law to shut out negroes from religious instruction, and to paralyze missionary exertions for their benefit: and this on the report of what they call their sectarian committee; and the principal evidence on which it is to be recommended to his majesty's government seems to have rested upon three persons: and who were they? One was the chop-house and tavern keeper to the honourable house of assembly. The second was a contractor for public buildings; and the third was a man already notorious for assisting in the imprisonment of your missionaries in that horrible jail in the parish of St. Ann's: and upon the evidence of these three worthies, a report comes out charging your missionaries with preaching sedition, and various other crimes; and a bill is founded upon it, which now awaits the royal signature. I wish I could believe that all this was mistake and misapprehension; but in my own judgment I am perfectly persuaded that the whole rests solely upon the principle of determined hatred to Christianity because it is opposed to slavery. His majesty will not give it his signature we are confident: no, there will be this soft reflection for him in his dying moments, that he has never lent his signature to any act of religious persecution; but, like his venerable father, he will have this consolation, that he has been the steady friend of religious liberty. I must say it, to the credit of our missionaries in Jamaica, that when this act had passed, and was sent home for signature, they all united to write, that if the missionary committee should direct them to submit to it, they must obey, and give up their charge; *that* they laid upon us; but if we forbid them not, they will proceed in their work, and are ready to go to prison. Yes, we have men willing to suffer, and even to die; and these are not the men to be forsaken by this society, or by the religious world. We know what the sentiment of the British parliament is,—how they redressed by one act, the persecutions in Barbadoes; and I trust, by the exertions of the friends of our missionaries, and of the Baptists, in the island of Jamaica, the shield of British liberty will be thrown over them; and that liberty which they have never forfeited, and which they have a right to enjoy in common with all British subjects, may be fully secured to them. This day, my lord, is the anniversary of the death of Dr. Coke, sixteen years ago. That is a name always to be mentioned with honour and veneration by us; a man whose ardent mind kindled the flame of missionary exertions in our societies, and whose spirit is now rejoicing in the success of his labours. He was the man who first carried our exertions to the West Indies, and was the father and founder of that mission which has brought so many sons to glory, and introduced so many into the liberty of the Gospel. May we possess his spirit, and take up that work

which he has left us as a legacy, and be steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in it, until the whole of those interesting colonies be filled with the light of the glorious Gospel.'

With respect to the effect of the labours of the Methodist missionaries in the West Indies, on the slaves themselves, we have the authentic and most unexceptionable testimony of 'the *Right Honourable Sir George H. Rose*,' who is himself an extensive slaveholder, in circumstances, as he states, beyond his control. The doubt expressed by the right honourable gentleman, whether he ought to divest himself of that property if he could, we presume had respect to what he conceived to be his obligations to the slaves. This question it is not necessary here to discuss,—our object at present being simply to show the acknowledged good effects of the labours of the missionaries on the slaves.

'You are well aware, [said Sir George H. Rose, at the anniversary above alluded to,] that I stand in a connexion which I cannot avoid or get rid of, to a property which came to me by law, and of which I doubt whether I ought to divest myself if I could, though it is the worst property a man can have, as to pounds, shillings, and pence. But I feel the salvation of the souls on those estates to press with a great weight upon my conscience; and the relief which I have received from this society under that most weighty concern of my life, has been unspeakable; but I should derive great satisfaction from attending here were this not the case, because, in the total absence of all selfishness except that which we must feel from the beneficial effects produced on our own minds in being so employed, it is impossible for any man, who desires to promote the cause of the Redeemer, to see the union of so much holy and Christian activity without great satisfaction. The discouragements you experience in some parts of your work are very great; but there are features in the civil existence of the Wesleyan society that must always command respect, and greatly obviate prejudices, in our colonies. But I have often derived instruction on this subject, from a consideration that we should seek knowledge from God's actions towards us, and from the analogy of the physical and moral world, as well as from the written word. What was the creation itself? the thought of the Almighty could have called the world into existence, and beauty, and order, in a moment. But was that the case? No; the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the Creator was pleased to take six days to complete it, in order to teach us that, as to the affairs of our own souls, and as to the evil which exists in the world without us, we begin in the dark; but if we arrive at light, and the little universe is complete, at the end of the sixth day, we shall have to bless Heaven for it on the seventh; and in the progress of the missionary work, this is the process we have to go through. But there is one thing amidst all the evils and discouragements that exist,—one practical fact, which I do feel to be cause of satisfaction and comfort beyond what I expected; and which I state, not as a triumph, but as an encouragement, lest we should faint under long and often cruelly ill

requited love. There is an estate of mine in Jamaica, which was under the instruction of your missionaries : a very pious and excellent clergyman, the rector of the parish, offered to take upon himself the instruction of the children ; and being myself a member of the Church of England, I felt that, in duty and prudence, I ought not to decline the offer. But the estate has been mainly in your missionaries' hands, and I felt the same satisfaction in one case as the other. But I found I could not withhold my consent ; and, in consequence of this change, an increase of good has been accomplished ; for the effect has been that the missionaries have directed their attention to another spot among the thousands in the island who have no Christian instruction. Some time last autumn, a most valued friend of mine, a county member of distinguished piety and humanity, himself deeply interested in the cause of the slaves, wrote to inform me that a young man, who had passed twelve years in Jamaica, had returned to England ; and as my friend had known him from a boy, he said I might entirely trust to his honour and truth, should I wish to see him. I immediately requested that he would favour me with his company ; and I made it my business to examine him as to the state of that property to which I have already alluded. I formed a high opinion of the young man ; indeed, I never yet saw one who impressed more upon me the persuasion of his perfect truth : and I must confess that his answers surprised me. I hardly dare state all that he told me, but a little I may say. He assured me that in all he had noticed in England, he had not seen a morality equal to that which prevailed on that estate ; he assured me solemnly, that though he had been three years in the neighbourhood, he could not put his hand upon one thief among the negroes, and one bad female he could not name. I examined him as if he had been a witness in a court of justice ; and he stated that every where order, and decency, and prosperity prevailed ; and that property had arisen from their industry ; that with respect to negro dances, that most fatal cause of immorality, and which render those who practise them a set of vagrants, there was not one negro on that estate, out of more than two hundred and fifty, who ever went to one of them ; and he assured me that there were many negroes on other estates of a similar character. I asked him, how long this had been the case, and to what cause it was to be attributed ? and he said it had been the case about seven years, and was mainly owing to an improved state of their minds, which no doubt is principally owing to the religious instructions of the missionaries. He stated that punishments are reduced to a mere nothing, and those of a severer kind are not more frequent than amongst an equal number of persons in our jails and regiments. This I state to you with sincere satisfaction and pleasure : a great work has been done, and a great change has taken place. A new rector has been catechising upon that estate ; and the children upon two estates are learning to read the Bible, and were examined, a short time ago, by the archdeacon, and some of them gained prizes. The bishop had examined them, and they were ordered to attend every Sunday to be catechised in the church. This is a state of things so different from what we have seen in times past, that I felt anxious to mention it to you as an encouragement in your important work.'

On the subject of prayer, the sanctity of the sabbath, the institution of marriage, parental and filial duties, the remarks of Mr. Watson are particularly valuable. The view which he takes of civil polity is evidently the result of deep reflection and much reading; and the doctrine which he lays down in reference to that important subject, is marked by great sobriety and moderation.

No precise system of ecclesiastical government, he contends, is laid down in the New Testament, as binding upon Christians; but certain offices are there specified which ought ever to be maintained; and principles relative to the discipline of the church are laid down, which it is left to the wisdom and piety of Christians to apply, and practically exemplify, under all providential circumstances, till the end of time. The following admirable paragraph concludes the chapter on this subject; the whole of which is entitled to more than ordinary attention:—

‘However difficult it may be, in some cases, to adjust modes of church government, so that, in the view of all, the principles of the New Testament may be fully recognised, and the end for which churches are collected may be effectually accomplished, this labour will always be greatly smoothed by a steady regard, on each side, to *duties*, as well as to *rights*. These are equally imperative upon ministers, upon subordinate officers, and upon the private members of every church. Charity, candour, humility, public spirit, zeal, a forgiving spirit, and the desire, the strong desire, of unity and harmony, ought to pervade all; as well as a constant remembrance of that great and solemn truth, that Christ is the *Judge*, as well as the *Saviour*, of his churches. Whilst the people are docile, obedient to the word of exhortation; willing to submit, “in the Lord,” to those who “preside over them,” and are charged to exercise Christ’s discipline; and whilst ministers are “gentle among them,” after the example of St. Paul; a gentleness, however, which, in his case, winked at no evil, and kept back no truth, and compromised no principle, and spared no obstinate and incurable offender; whilst they feed the flock of Christ with sound doctrine, and are intent upon their edification, watching over them “as they that must give account,” and study, live, and labour for no other ends, than to present that part of the church committed to their care, “perfect in Christ Jesus;” every church will fall, as it were, naturally, and without effort, into its proper “order.” Pure and undefiled religion in churches, like the first poetry, creates those subordinate rules by which it is afterwards guarded and governed; and the best canons of both are those which are dictated by the fresh and primitive effusions of their own inspiration.’—(p. 354.)

The controversy concerning baptism is somewhat largely discussed in this part of the ‘*Institutes*,’ the right of children to be admitted to that ordinance is very ably defended; and its administration by pouring or sprinkling, is clearly shown to be the mode which is sanctioned by Scripture. The prejudice which requires every candidate for admission into the church to submit to immersion is animadverted upon in strong language; but the terms used,

we think, are fully justified by the nature of the case. The practice offends greatly against delicacy; and its danger in regard to health is often imminent. It would be impossible within the limits prescribed to this notice to give even an outline of this excellent discussion. The volume concludes with a chapter on the Lord's Supper.

We sincerely congratulate the author, and the persons for whose benefit the 'Theological Institutes' were undertaken, on the completion of this work. Some of the junior ministers belonging to the Methodist body have enjoyed the advantages of a liberal education, and are well prepared by previous literary and theological study for the office which they sustain. Others of them, however, have not been thus favored. Their piety and natural talents will not be questioned by those who are acquainted with them, and their labours are justly esteemed by those who sit under their ministry; but they need greater assistance in the prosecution of their studies than has yet been given to them.—Mr. Watson's work will be of great utility to them in several respects. It will assist them in forming an acquaintance with the entire system of Christianity: for those who 'labour in the word and doctrine,' should not confine their attention to any particular set of doctrines, but should diligently, and in the spirit of prayer, investigate the whole 'truth as it is in Jesus.' Called, with St. Paul to 'declare the whole counsel of God,' every minister of Christ should study the doctrines of religion in their connexion with each other, with the attributes of God, the spiritual privileges of believers, and the moral obligations of mankind. By this means only can the Christian scribe become 'well instructed,' and qualified to bring out of his treasury 'things new and old,' to the edification and comfort of the people who attend his ministrations. To say that the 'Theological Institutes' are complete would be folly. Works of this nature are capable of amplification to an indefinite extent; and the ever varying forms of error call for new defences of the truth; but we feel ourselves fully justified in saying, there is no work of the same kind in the English language from which the persons for whose benefit it is intended can derive so much valuable instruction.

The spirit which pervades this publication is worthy of the highest praise; and is of the utmost importance to every theologian. All its reasonings are conducted with an absolute deference to the holy Scriptures; and no doctrine or duty is made to rest upon abstract speculation. Every subject is discussed with becoming seriousness; and the tendency of the whole is to promote a spirit of pure and elevated devotion. No novel and dubious opinions are introduced, and forced upon the attention of the reader; nor is an undue importance given to any one branch of Divine truth above the rest. The moderation with which every subject is treated is very marked and striking. In opposing one extreme, no countenance is given to the opposite error; in discussing questions which for ages have been the subjects of acrimonious controversy, irritating

language is carefully avoided ; and those Christians whose opinions are opposed, must be compelled to own that they are themselves treated with respect and kindness. It is not meant to insinuate that this work is faultless. The language in which it is written is dignified and manly, but is occasionally deficient in accuracy and precision. Several of the sentences are too long and involved, and the composition sometimes betrays haste ; but altogether, the work is a noble monument of sanctified talent, and will secure for the author a large share of gratitude and esteem.

SUNDAY MAILS.

[As the subject of the following article is not only an interesting one in itself, but one on which many of our readers will probably be called on to form and to express an opinion, and in some way to act, we think it due to them to put them in possession of the best information in relation to it, so as at least to assist them to judge and act understandingly. The most rational*and dispassionate essay which we have yet seen on the subject, is one which appeared in the last (July) number of the *North American Review*,—a work edited, we believe, by a gentleman of the Unitarian persuasion, and one which will hardly be suspected of encouraging over-strictness in religion, or any hybridous alliance between church and state. We confess that we were agreeably disappointed in seeing such an article, on the *Sunday Mail* question, from this quarter. And believing that every conscientious man, who wishes to act under a due sense of moral and religious obligation, every true Christian, and every true patriot, must desire an enlightened acquaintance with the laws, human and divine, under which he is placed, and by which he ought to be governed, together with those sound and enlightened views of policy, and of individual, social, and national happiness which are ever in accordance with the will of God concerning us, we shall here copy this article entire. Very many of our readers will probably not otherwise have an opportunity of seeing it ; and should any of them have heretofore even differed in opinion from the conclusion to which it comes on the question discussed, they cannot but be gratified with the temperate and manly tone of the argument itself, and with the decided stand which it takes in support of a becoming sense of moral and religious duty, as well in our halls of legislation as elsewhere. The idea, we fear too often acted on, that a legislator, as soon as he is invested with that high office, is freed from all responsibility to God and conscience, and is to be guided by mere party feelings, and party spirit, and party interests, or even any merely sectional or local interests, when confessedly or notoriously in opposition to the general good, is preposterous in itself, does destructive violence to the moral sense, and lays the ground-work of despotism, anarchy,

and ruin. This idea is ably and justly exposed in the article which follows, and which we commend to the reader's calm and attentive perusal.]

From the North American Review.

Report of the Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States on Post Offices and Post Roads, to whom were referred the Memorials for and against prohibiting the Transportation of the Mails and the Distribution of Letters on Sunday.

Counter Report of the Minority of the same Committee.

THE laws of the United States which regulate the operations of the post office department, although they contain no specific provision on the subject, have been supposed by the executive officers of the government to authorize the transportation of the mail, and the distribution of letters on Sunday. Whether this construction be conformable to the intentions of the legislature, or to the spirit which has prevailed in the construction of the laws, which regulate the operations of all the other departments of the government, may well be doubted. The practice of the post office certainly forms an exception to that of all the other branches of the administration, whether of the general or state governments, in all their ramifications, as well to that of the citizens at large, both in their individual and corporate capacities. The sittings of congress and of all the state legislatures are regularly suspended on Sunday. The courts of justice, the custom houses, the banks, the land offices, the compting rooms, offices, warehouses, and shops of private individuals, are all closed on that day. The post office alone continues its usual labours with unremitted activity, and with but little variation in its modes of proceeding. As the laws which regulate the operations of all the other departments, although equally silent on the subject, have been all construed to intend a discontinuance of the transaction of business on Sunday, it would perhaps have been more natural to put a similar construction on the post office laws. For some reason or other—probably by the effect of mere accident—a different system has prevailed, and the practice of this branch of the public service has hitherto formed, as we have just remarked, an exception to the rule observed in all the rest.

The singularity of this circumstance, to whatever cause it may have been owing, has for some time past attracted the attention of many of the citizens in all parts of the country, and numerous memorials have been annually transmitted to congress, setting forth the supposed inconveniences of the present state of things, and requesting such a modification of the existing laws, as would effect a change. Other memorials have in turn been transmitted in favor of perseverance in the existing system. There is no appearance of any improper or dangerous motive for these proceedings on either side; nor have those who have taken part in them been arrayed on one side or the other according to any sectarian divisions. The several religious sects, which, from their agreement in certain fun-

damental points of belief, are popularly denominated *orthodox*, are among those, which are apparently most desirous of a change in the existing practice ; while some other sects of considerable influence in particular parts of the country, and which hold a different opinion upon the points alluded to, have appeared to agree with their orthodox brethren upon this. It is understood that one of the petitions for a change in the existing practice was drawn up and headed by a justly respected Unitarian clergyman of this city, and extensively signed by individuals of the same persuasion. As the memorials in favour of a change proceed from citizens of all the different religious sects, it is probable, although we have not so direct a knowledge of the fact, that the same is the case with those who pray for the maintenance of the existing system. Both parties are, no doubt, equally honest in their belief of the expediency of the courses which they respectively recommend. The memorials on the subject, transmitted to the last and present congress, were referred to committees which reported in both houses against a change. The petitioners are, however, apparently not discouraged, and will probably continue their efforts at the future sessions of congress. The question, like every other connected with religious belief and practice, naturally excites a strong interest throughout the community ; and we have thought that a few remarks upon it might not be uninteresting to some of our readers. The report, which forms the immediate subject of this article, is attributed to Colonel Johnson, of Kentucky, who acted as chairman of the committee, and who had previously, when acting in the same capacity in the senate, made a report on the same subject to that body, corresponding very nearly in substance with this. The counter report, or protest, of the minority is attributed to Mr. Macreary.

Whenever any change is proposed in the existing laws, or the practice under them, it rests, as a general rule, with the party or person recommending it, to prove its necessity or expediency ; and on this principle it would belong to the petitioners against the present system to show that it ought to be abolished. In this particular case, however, it strikes us that the general presumption against innovation, and in favor of existing laws and practices, considered as such, is rebutted by the fact to which we have already adverted—that the practice in the post office department is different from that which prevails in all the others. If the people, acting in their corporate capacity through their different agents, consider it a religious duty to suspend all the other operations of government on Sunday, a presumption arises, that those of the post office should also be suspended for the same reason. The presumption being then in favor of a change, the burden of proof rests with those who support the existing system ; and it belongs to them to show why the practice in the post office department ought to form an exception to that which prevails in all the others, and why the same religious considerations, which induce the people to suspend all their

other political and private labours on Sunday, should not induce them to discontinue the transportation of the mail and the distribution of letters.

The committee, though apparently actuated by good intentions, and a laudable anxiety to maintain the political and civil rights of the citizens, have, we think, been led into error by not adverting sufficiently to the considerations detailed above. So far, indeed, are they from appearing to be aware, that the practice of the post office department is an exception from the rule observed in all the others, that they evidently consider the petitioners for a change in this practice as endeavoring to make it such. Thus they inquire, in the course of their report, 'Why the petitioners have confined their prayer to the mails—why they have not requested that government be required to suspend all its executive functions on that day—why they have not required that our ships shall not sail—that our armies shall not march—that officers of justice shall not seize the suspected or guard the convicted?' The committee, when they put these questions, had obviously lost sight of the fact, that all the other functions of government—executive, legislative, and judicial—are in fact suspended on Sunday, excepting in a few particular cases, like those which they enumerate, and which are made exceptions to the general rule on account of the great inconvenience which would result from its observation. If the jailer, for instance, were to suspend the exercise of his duty on Sunday, his prisoners would all escape; so that there is an absolute necessity for his continuing it. If the commander of an army were to suspend the exercise of his functions every seventh day, his adversary might, under certain critical circumstances, obtain such an advantage over him, as would decide the fate of a campaign—perhaps the political situation of the country. Here the inconvenience of observing the rule is so great as to produce a moral necessity of violating it, and so of all the other cases mentioned. The practice of the post office can only be justified, if at all, in the same way, as a case of exception. The report, by not adverting to this circumstance, and by employing in support of the present system only certain general considerations, which might be applied with equal force in any other branch of the public service, proves either too much or nothing at all. The inconveniences apprehended by the committee from a discontinuance of the existing system, are of a remote and prospective kind, such as the tendency to a union of church and state, and the inconvenience of diminishing in any way the activity of the business of private life. Now it is quite obvious, that these inconveniences, if there be any danger at all of their occurrence, would be as likely to result from a discontinuance on Sunday of the business of any other department as of that of the post office. If the suspension of the transportation of the mail on that day have a tendency to bring about a union of church and state—an apprehension which we believe to be wholly groundless—

it is clear to us, that a suspension of the sessions of congress, of the state legislatures, or of the courts of justice, must have the same tendency in a still greater degree, in proportion to the superior importance of the business which would thus be kept in abeyance. Hence the reasoning of the committee, as we have just remarked, tends, as far as it has any weight, to show that the whole business of the administration ought to proceed with the same activity on Sunday as on any other day of the week. The argument, if it prove any thing, proves a great deal too much; and of course in reality proves nothing.

This defect in the reasoning of the committee is obviously a fatal one, and we are of course authorized, without seeking for any other, to reject their conclusion. It may not, however, be improper, considering the interesting character of the question, to examine a little more particularly the real importance of the objections alleged by them, to the application in the post office department of the same rule which is observed in all the others. These objections, as we have already seen, by proving too much, prove nothing—but independently of this defect, and supposing that we were willing to admit their validity to the full extent to which they can be applied, it will appear, we think, on examination, that they have in fact little or no real weight for any purpose. They are, if we rightly understand the reasoning of the report, the two following:

1. The tendency of the suspension of the transportation of the mail, and the distribution of letters on Sunday, to effect a union of Church and State.

2. The practical inconvenience which would result from such a measure, in the diminished activity of the ordinary business of life.

The second of these objections is the only one which appears to us to possess much plausibility, but as the former is that on which the committee insist most strongly, and which they evidently regard as the more important of the two, it may be proper to give it a moment's consideration.

On this head it is argued by the committee, that there are various opinions in the community, as to the proper manner of observing the sabbath; that each individual has hitherto been left to pursue his own course; but that the effect of suspending the transportation of the mail on that day, would be to decide the question in favor of those who prefer a particular system, and would therefore come within the spirit of the clause of the constitution, which prohibits any legislative preference of one religious sect over another. It does not appear to have occurred to the committee, when they employed this argument, that the act of congress regulating the transportation of the mail must necessarily provide either for carrying it or not carrying it on Sunday; and that if a provision for not carrying it be decisive of the question at issue between the sects in favor of one, a provision for carrying it is of course as

decisive in favor of another. This being the case, it is obvious that the existing system involves precisely the same violation of the spirit of the constitution, which, if any, would result from the other.

It is plain to us, however, that there is not in either case, any violation of the spirit of the constitution, as there is confessedly none of the letter. The enactment of a law regulating the transportation of the mail is admitted to be within the power of congress, and this law must, as we have just remarked, provide either for carrying or not carrying it on Sunday. In adopting one or the other part of the alternative, each member of congress will naturally be governed by his own views of expediency and duty, excepting so far as he may have the instructions of his constituents. If he would hesitate as a private individual to travel or order his agents to travel on Sunday upon his own business, he will probably in like manner decline, as a representative of the people, to order their agents so to do. If, on the other hand, he would feel no scruple on the subject in his private capacity, he would probable feel none in his public one. In either case, it does not appear to us, that he imposes any trammels upon the consciences or acts of others. Each member of the community retains the same right that he possessed before of travelling or not travelling on Sunday, according to his own peculiar views, and, if these views have not been carried into effect by his political representative, he retains in full force his former right of giving his vote for another at the next election. In all this we can discern no appearance of any thing unconstitutional, either in letter or spirit, or of any thing at variance with the regular routine of ordinary legislation.

It is intimated, indeed, by the committee, that a political representative ought not in any case to be guided in the discharge of his official duty by religious considerations, and the same opinion is still more decidedly expressed in certain newspaper essays on the subject, that have happened to fall under our observation; the writer of which considers the 'being influenced in the exercise of temporal power by religious belief,' as neither more nor less than the union of church and state, and afterwards declares, that 'it is the sacred duty of a representative, before he gives his vote upon a point any wise connected with religious considerations, to search the inmost recesses of his conscience, and to ascertain that religious belief is not operating in his mind as a motive to that vote.' But, independently of the objection already stated to this argument, as applied to the present case, namely, that a vote in favor of carrying the mail on Sunday is as much given from religious considerations, though of a different kind, as one against it, it is clear to us, that there is some very singular perversion of language, or obliquity of judgment, implied in these remarks, which if taken in their natural and obvious sense, are directly at variance with the plainest suggestions of reason, and the letter and spirit of Scripture. Instead of being bound, as the writer of them supposes, to exclude all reli-

gious considerations in giving his vote upon a subject connected with religion, the representative is undoubtedly bound on that, and on every other occasion, whether of a public or private character, to act under the influence of religious considerations. 'Whether we eat or drink, or *whatever we do*,' we are directed in Scripture to 'do all to the praise and glory of God.' It is expressly enjoined on rulers in particular, to govern *in the fear of the Lord*. It is in fact the peculiar virtue of religion, as a motive of action, that it is applicable on every occasion, and to every part of conduct. It is one branch of our religious duty to obey the constitution and laws of the land; and if the constitution prohibit the establishment of a national church, it is the religious duty of a representative, even though he individually prefer an establishment, to vote against any project of the kind, until the prohibition in the constitution be repealed; but even in voting against an establishment, he is or ought to be as much influenced by religious considerations, as if he voted in favor of it. It is impossible, in short, to conceive a case, either in public or private life, in which it is not the duty of every member of the community to act under the influence of religious motives; and in proportion as an individual is more completely influenced by such motives to the exclusion of any others, which have their origin in mere expediency, so much the more probable is it that he will avoid error, and render himself acceptable to the Great Judge, to whom he is ultimately to give an account of the deeds done in the body.

The assertion, that the union of church and state consists in being influenced in the exercise of temporal power by religious belief, seems to argue a great looseness of ideas upon the whole subject. The being influenced in the exercise of temporal power by religious belief is a particular state of mind, or, if habitual, a particular trait of character in individuals;—the union of church and state is a form of political institutions. To say that one of them is the other, is about as correct as it would be to say that courage is a military despotism—temperance a constitutional monarchy—or the love of liberty a republic. If the remark alluded to be merely—as is probable enough—an incorrect mode of expressing the idea that a disposition in individuals to act from religious motives has a tendency to bring about a union of church and state, the objection is rather more intelligible, though not much better founded than on the other construction. Religious motives are, as we have shown, the best under which we can possibly act, and tend of course to produce the best possible results. If one of these results be the union of church and state, it could only be because this union is the best of all possible modes of regulating the relations between religion and government. Hence the committee, in affirming that a disposition in individuals to act from religious motives tends to bring about a union of church and state, affirm by implication that this union is an excellent institution—which is pro-

bably not their intention, and is, at all events, not the opinion of the people of the United States. If a union of church and state be, as is generally supposed, and as the committee appear to think, a dangerous institution, it is certain that the surest way of steering clear of it, is for the public agents to act in all cases to the best of their ability on the best and purest motives, which are, undoubtedly, the fear of God and the honest intention to do his will. The moment you allow any weight to considerations of mere expediency in opposition to these, you open a door to corruptions of every kind, which are the more likely to gain admittance in proportion as the names they bear are more respectable and plausible.

For ourselves, so far are we from apprehending any practical inconvenience from the influence of religious motives in legislation, that we should consider an extension of this influence as one of the most fortunate things that could possibly happen to the country. The great evil in practical legislation is the influence of corrupt, or low and narrow views. How often does the passage or rejection of an important law depend entirely upon the relative strength of political parties, divided perhaps by considerations wholly foreign to the subject of it! During the last session of congress we have seen the newspapers of a political party declaring, with great satisfaction, that the question of the right of a member elect to take his seat was decided by a *party vote*. When the motive is not absolutely corrupt, how often is it of a low and narrow cast! A legislator votes in favor of a rail road because it passes through his own town, or against it because it does not. If he happen to live in a cotton growing state, he opposes the protecting policy; if in a manufacturing one, he supports it; if he remove from the latter to the former, he leaves his former creed behind him and takes up that of his new residence. The only sure way of rising above the influence of improper motives, whether absolutely vicious, or only narrow, is to give no weight to any considerations but those of duty, or in other words, religious principle. The individual, whether in public or private life, who pursues this course, is sure of doing right as far as he knows what right is; and we are all but too well aware, that our practical errors are much less frequently the result of not knowing what is right than of a disinclination to do it.

We have enlarged rather more upon this objection than its real importance perhaps rendered necessary, which, as we have remarked above, and have since endeavored to show, is very little. The other, which is founded on the practical inconvenience that would result from suspending the transportation of the mail, and the delivery of letters on Sunday, is the only one which appears to us to have any considerable weight. But even this is not, in our opinion, of a very decisive character.

It is no doubt true, that the rapidity of the progress of all private business would, to a certain extent, be diminished by the change in question; but it will hardly be pretended that the inconvenience

resulting from this diminution, is of such a kind as to make out a case of necessity, which would authorize the community in waiving the observation of the moral and religious rules, of which they acknowledge the obligation in all others. The committee, certainly, have not proved or attempted to prove the reality of any such necessity. They say that if you stop the mail one day in seven, you retard by one seventh the advancement of the country. This reasoning supposes that the mail is the only instrument that is or can be employed for the advancement of civilization—a supposition which is obviously incorrect. It is, no doubt, one and a very useful instrument for that purpose. The objection more correctly stated would be, that if you stop the mail one day in seven you diminish by one seventh the efficacy of the post office in producing the advantages that naturally result from it. This is true; but it is only an application to a particular branch of labour of the general proposition, that if you suspend the labour of the community one day in seven, you make the labour of the community one seventh part less productive than it otherwise would be. This we know, or at least may admit for argument's sake; but notwithstanding this, there are certain religious and moral considerations, which induce the community as a general rule to suspend all their labours one day in seven. Why should not this rule be applied to the labour employed in carrying the mails as well as to all the rest? As the committee think that it ought not to be, it was their business to tell us why; but it is obviously not sufficient to tell us, that the labour of the post office department would be immediately, in the case supposed, one seventh part less productive in a given time than it was before. This is a matter of course, and the principle is as true of all the other departments as of the post office. But why deduce from it in regard to that department a conclusion, which you do not deduce from it in regard to any other? Why, in short, make the practice of the post office department an exception to that of all the others? This, as we have repeatedly said, is the real question, and it is one to which the committee have not attempted to reply.

Although we have admitted, for the sake of the argument, in the above remarks, that the labour of the community, if suspended one day in seven, is for that reason one seventh part less productive, we are far from thinking that such is in fact the case. We believe, on the contrary, that this is one of the instances in which two and two do not make four. Whether we consider labour as intended to produce the immediate result, wealth, or the more remote one, well-being physical and moral, we have no hesitation in saying, that we believe it becomes more instead of less productive by an occasional suspension. We all know that our faculties cannot be kept for ever on the stretch. Without the nightly intervention of that 'blessed thing sleep,' as Coleridge calls it, to suspend our toils and labours, soothe our cares, and recruit our strength, we should all, in a very

short time, go mad and die. But the preservation of a sound, healthy, active, and cheerful condition of our nature requires, in addition to this, an occasional suspension of labour for longer periods ; and it was, doubtless, in the kind view of accommodating his commands to the constitution which he had given us, that the Creator prescribed the observance of a weekly day of rest. The man who constantly pursues his worldly objects without allowing himself a moment's leisure, gradually acquires, by a sort of moral gravitation, an accelerated and feverish intensity of action, which, if not checked in one way or another, ends in extravagance, bankruptcy, and ruin. By wholly diverting his thoughts one day in seven from business, and turning them upon the high and glorious subject of his intellectual and moral relations to God, his fellow men, and the universe, he cools the fever of his mind ; and when he takes up his affairs again on Monday morning, he is surprised to find with how much clearer a judgment he considers the plans and purposes of which he took leave on Saturday. He now perceives errors, that before escaped his attention,—rejects imprudent projects that before presented themselves in tempting colours to his heated fancy—and if his gains at the end of the week be one seventh less, they will probably at the end of the year, be seventy fold more. Instead of being a miserable bankrupt, he will be a thriving, healthy, happy man. We have no hesitation in saying that the fault we have here indicated of a too urgent pursuit of worldly gain, is a common trait in the character of our countrymen, and that a more exclusive devotion of the sabbath to repose and religious contemplation would be a most wholesome corrective of the evil. We strain every nerve to the utmost, employ every cent of capital that we own or can borrow, and not content with obtaining an honorable subsistence for ourselves and our families by the regular practice of our respective callings, grasp, with an agonizing effort, at any project that holds out the least prospect of extraordinary gain. What follows ? A few persons amass immense fortunes, the possession of which has no very favorable effect upon their own characters, or those of their children. The rest—at the first little convulsion in the world of business—are swept—like dead leaves before a November blast—into the gulf of bankruptcy. It would be vain to deny that the general habits of our active men of every class correspond in the main with this description ; and it is in our opinion equally certain, that a real and *bona fide* suspension of worldly cares one day in seven would greatly improve—were it only by its negative and sedative effects—the state of mind which leads to these extravagant efforts and their disastrous results. It is, in short, clear to us, that the labour of the community—by being suspended one day in seven—becomes, not less, but on the contrary a great deal more productive of mere wealth, than it otherwise would be.

But this view of the subject, however important, is by no means the most so of those which may be taken of it. The object of all

this toil and trouble—these convulsive strainings and desperate enterprises—is after all the acquisition of the means of subsistence—‘meat, clothes, and fire,’—nothing more. But this, though a legitimate object of pursuit in life, is far from being the only one. It belongs entirely to our lower and animal nature. The intellectual and moral principle—the God within the mind—that loftier and nobler portion of our being, by which we hold affinity with the Sublime Spirit that created and informs the universe—this too has its claims; and they are of a far more urgent and momentous character than those of the other. But how can we do them justice if our thoughts are for ever absorbed, without the interruption of a day, an hour, a moment, in the routine of business? Our intellectual and moral nature is refined and exalted by study, solitary musing, or instructive conversation on elevated subjects—by the interchange of kind and charitable feelings—by the contemplation of the goodness of the Creator, as shown forth in the majesty, harmony, and beauty of his works. If we mean to rise in the scale of being above the tools we work with, or the brute animals that we employ, we must allow ourselves time for these ennobling and delightful pursuits. The merchant must not nail himself for ever to his counter like a bad shilling; and the lawyer should remember that there is one Supreme Court in which his precedents will lose their authority, and his special pleas their importance—that there is one case, and that his own, which he must finally argue upon its merits. Let it be enough, that the business of the world is pursued with unremitted activity and perseverance from Monday morning to Saturday night. When Sunday comes, let the weary be at rest—let the labourer of every kind cease from his toil, and go up to the house of God, not to ruminate upon the affairs of the preceding week, or to lay new plans for the coming one—but to yield up his whole soul to the current of lofty contemplations which the scene and the service are fitted to inspire—to feel the ravishing influence of sacred song—to indulge the devout aspirations that lift the humble spirit in holy trances to the footstool of the Almighty. Nor let him think it too hard, if in the mean time his letters remain unread in the post office. They will not grow stale before to-morrow. His communion with God is of much more consequence than his correspondence with his agent or consignee. Whatever the mere man of business may think of it, this is, after all, a matter of high importance. Unless the deepest thinkers have erred in their conclusions from the most mature experience and reflection—unless the strongest feelings within us are all delusion—unless the word of revelation be a lie—it is certain that our mysterious nature is only one of the transitory forms of a permanent existence—that our lot hereafter will be determined for ever by the use that we make of our faculties here. ‘As the tree falleth, so it must lie.’ If we voluntarily degrade our minds in this world to the level of the brutes, it is impossible that we can start in the race of eternity with so much

advantage as others, who have done their best to strengthen, exalt, and purify the intellectual and moral principle that survives the body. These are at once glorious and fearful truths. They are truths which the greatest sages and lawgivers of every age, from Moses to Numa, and from Numa to Franklin, have kept in view in their political creations. No state of ancient or modern times ever obtained any real stability, of which the government did not rest, in one way or another, on the steadfast and immovable rock of Religion. Under our free and happy forms of political constitution, the only way in which this salutary principle can produce its beneficial effects, is by its influence on public opinion; and however much we may regret to differ from the very respectable committee, whose report we have been examining, and the writers who concur with them, we have no hesitation in expressing our conviction that the people of the United States have nothing better, in regard to their political concerns, to hope or wish, than that all their agents should be *influenced in the exercise of temporal power by religious belief*. This would not bring about, as the writer above alluded to supposes, without apparently attaching any very distinct meaning to the terms, a *union of church and state*; but it would procure us the blessing of Providence—a wise, liberal, efficient, and above all, honest, administration of the government in all its branches—a condition of general and constantly progressive prosperity—and to sum up all in one word—peace.

On reviewing the above, we perceive that we have omitted to notice the suggestion thrown out in the report, that this subject comes properly within the jurisdiction of the state governments; but we cannot think that the committee would themselves, on further reflection, maintain this doctrine. The regulation of post offices and post roads is plainly attributed by the letter of the constitution to the United States.

HISTORY OF METHODISM IN WASHINGTON COUNTY, OHIO.

BY THE REV. SAMUEL HAMILTON.

To the Editors of the Methodist Magazine and Quarterly Review:

VERY DEAR BRETHREN,—In imitation of our brother, the Rev. James O. Andrew, in the south, and others, in whose historical productions we have taken a deep interest, and in compliance with your request, we have collected a short, and we hope, (as far as it goes,) correct history of the Methodist Church in Washington county, Ohio; hoping that our brethren in general, and those of the west in particular, will follow the example, and give the world a history of the American Methodist Church. This should be done, as well for the information of the present generation, as for the good of posterity. If such historical facts have not buoyancy enough to sustain them in this age, let them be joined to others more buoyant, and they will float down the stream of time, and be taken up by the historian

of coming years as a valuable prize. I am, with sentiments of deep and lasting respect, your brother in the bonds of a peaceful gospel.

Marietta, Ohio, 4th June, 1830.

SAMUEL HAMILTON.

THE county of Washington was the first organized county in the North Western Territory. The town of Marietta, the seat of justice, is situated at the junction of the Muskingum and Ohio rivers, in latitude thirty-nine degrees, twenty-eight minutes, and forty-two seconds, north, and in longitude, four degrees, twenty minutes, west of the city of Washington.

In 1787, a company organized themselves in Boston, and took the name of 'The Ohio Company.' The principal part of this company were officers and soldiers in the revolutionary war; men who had spent their time, strength, and property, in giving birth to our nation, and who had but little at the end of that great national struggle, excepting the final settlement notes given them by the government, as a remuneration for their services. Those brave fathers of our nation, being unsupported by pensions, found it difficult to submit to the heavy hand of poverty, in a country full of wealth; they therefore exchanged with the general government their final settlement notes for a million and a half acres of wild land in Ohio. One hundred thousand acres of this land were given to actual settlers,—one hundred acres each. One thirty-sixth was given for the support of common schools, and as much more for the support of the gospel. Two townships (or 46,080 acres) were given for the support of a state seminary. All this was done to invite emigrants, and for the good of posterity.

On the 7th of April, 1788, forty-seven men landed on the spot where the town of Marietta now stands. No traces of human beings were to be seen, excepting the marks of the ax-man who followed the surveyor, the recently deserted wigwam of the modern Indian, and the mounds, covered ways, and fortifications of a people 'unknown to song.' Immured in an immense wilderness, this band of brothers were permitted to taste the sweets of solitude for a season; but the temperate climate, fertile soil, and flattering prospects of the country, soon induced others to follow them. Thus their number increased, and their prospects brightened, until 1790. It was then found that the county could muster four hundred and forty-seven men, one hundred and three of whom had families. But as their prosperous sun was rising to its meridian splendour, in a fatal hour it was obscured behind a dark and portentous cloud; nor did it again appear with its wonted brightness for four years.

In 1791, the Indians became hostile, and their hostilities continued for four years. Considering the exposed situation of the whites, their means of defence, and the disparity of their numbers, it is utterly astonishing how they sustained the shock so long. Had it not been for the undaunted courage, unbending fortitude, and profound skill of those veterans, who had been educated in the

school of danger, they must have fallen victims to the relentless fury of their savage enemy. It was their business to defend themselves. This they did so effectually, that they lost but thirty in all;—twenty-three killed, and seven taken prisoners. In 1795, they hailed with delight the return of peace, left their fortifications, and returned to their farms.

The first settlers were principally *Predestinarians*, subdivided into Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and a few regular Baptists. Soon after the first company landed, a church was organized in Marietta, and Dr. Story became the officiating minister in the congregation. From this time a form of godliness was kept up by them,—how much of the power they possessed, we are not prepared to say. The united testimony, however, of the people who lived in those days, and saw things as they were, leads us to conclude that vital piety was at a low ebb. Professors appear to have met the *world's people* on middle ground, offered up a peace offering, and engaged with them in all the amusements and pastimes of the age. So great was the amalgamation of light and darkness, that an angel's eye might have failed to draw the line of demarkation between the man of the world and the member of the church. In this condition Methodism found the great mass of the people in Washington county,—in their own estimation rich, and increased with goods, and having need of nothing, and knowing not that they were wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked.

Reece Woolf, (a local preacher,) in a letter to me, writes thus: 'In April, 1798, I settled on the Little Kenhawa, Wood county, Virginia. At that time Methodism was unknown in this country. As soon as I came I commenced preaching, and the next fall and winter a revival took place. I made up a class of twenty-one members, and soon found I had more work to do than I well could perform. I cried to the Lord for help; I wrote a letter to Bishop Asbury, and another to the Baltimore Conference, to be held in the stone chapel, near Baltimore, the next spring. In June following, I had the best kind of evidence that God and the Church had heard my Macedonian cry. Brother Robert Manley was sent on to our help, and the little flock I had gathered submitted to the government of the Methodist Episcopal Church.'

June 1st, 1799, Mr. Manley took charge of the infant church in Wood county, Virginia. He appears to have spent nineteen days in that part of the country, where he found five or six preaching places. These limits were quite too small for a man whose heart burned with zeal for the glory of God, and the salvation of men, and who had received a commission from the great Head of the church to preach the gospel to every creature. He therefore cast an anxious eye across the Ohio river, where he saw a vast territory on which a Methodist preacher had never set his foot, and in which many families were *indeed* destitute of the bread of life. He beheld their souls in ruin, and hastened to give them relief, by setting before them the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. On the 20th, he crossed

the Ohio, and came into Marietta ; but found no rest for the sole of his foot,—no Laban to say to the servant in pursuit of a spouse for his Master, ‘Come in, thou blessed of the Lord ;’ for an itinerant Methodist preacher, Methodist doctrines, and Methodist economy, were to this people as strange and unlooked for as Columbus’s ship and party were to the natives of our land. It was not his object to pull down others, but to feed the destitute with the bread of life ; he therefore left the town, and directed his attention to the more destitute but less jealous people of the country ; hoping to find some noble Bereans, who would test him and his doctrines by the infallible standard of truth. In his first tour he visited each settlement in the county—found a Presbyterian, a Congregational, and a Baptist minister ; but many new and small, but growing neighbourhoods, were totally destitute of all sanctuary opportunities. In the most of those settlements, he found open doors for his reception. He also found Solomon Goss, and two members of his family, who had experienced the blessed effects of Methodism in their own hearts. This family, when on their way from the east to Ohio, stopped a season in West Liberty, where they were awakened and converted to God by the instrumentality of T. Fleming. If others opened their doors through vain curiosity, to hear what the babbler could say, this family opened theirs from the noblest and best feelings of their hearts. As their attachments to the church were early in their beginning, so they have been deep and constant to the present time.

This was an eventful year ; for in it the public mind became deeply and correctly impressed with the beauty and importance of a plan perfectly adapted to the wants of a new and thinly populated country. The way was opened, a number of small classes were formed, and a circuit was organized in Ohio ; and much good seed was sown, that ripened into maturity in after years. The next year, Jesse Stoneman and James Quinn were sent on to take charge of those little flocks in the wilderness. Thus a regular succession of ministers has been kept up for thirty years, each watering in his turn the seed sown by the other ; during which time the ranks of the wicked one have been greatly thinned ; and the regions of glory peopled with many immortal souls.

A number of years now passed with good success in the country. The classes which had been formed, flourished in the principal part of the neighbourhoods. Many had experienced ‘the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost,’ and loved the church with great tenderness. But in town every effort appeared to be weak and unsuccessful. In 1804, the undaunted, and deeply pious, George Askins, made a bold push, and appointed a camp-meeting in town, on a spot of public land. The members from the country erected a stand, fixed their seats, and pitched their tents ; the people of the town attended, looked shy, and stood at a distance. And while the bending heavens broke in blessings on

the former, there were no mighty works done among the latter, because of unbelief. The preachers broke up the meeting with mingled emotions, cast down and disappointed for the town, but grateful to God for what he had done for the country. All agreed to pray for the outpouring of the Spirit of God on Marietta. The next year, Jacob Young and G. C. Light appointed a second meeting on the same ground. The congregation met as before. Great seriousness pervaded the whole assembly, and the sons of Levi were anointed afresh to explain to and enforce upon the people the nature and necessity of salvation. Many saw its importance, and felt that without it life is a maze of error and wickedness, death a gulf of horror and misery, and eternity a scene of indignation and wrath. The grace which accompanied the ministration of the word, wrote the law of God upon many hearts, both in town and country. Of those in town, Jonas Johnson was the most prominent. This man had been a disciple of Thomas Paine. He was a most charming singer, and had a great redundancy of wicked songs. In this way, he exerted an influence over and led men who possessed intellects far superior to his own. When Johnson returned to the Shepherd and Bishop of his soul, he did it with all his heart, and in a short time came out in religion as bright as the noonday sun. In a few days he committed his infidel books and obscene songs to the flames; supplied their places with the Holy Bible and a Methodist hymn book; and, like Obed-edom, opened his house to receive the ark of the Lord. *Hallowed house of grateful memory.* In a short time a lovely little class was raised up to worship God in spirit and in truth. For months and years together, this class seldom ever met to worship without being assaulted by a lawless mob, who stoned the house, broke the windows, fired squibs, and covered the chimney, in order to annoy the worshippers with smoke, and drive them from the house of God. In this way a number of years passed. Some of the members let patience have its perfect work; but others were in danger of fainting. About this time, God, in his merciful providence, raised up a few young men who knew their legal privileges, and who put down those heaven-daring mortals that had persecuted their fellow men for no other crime than that of living godly in Christ Jesus, and enjoying their inalienable rights as free men. Those young men, by Divine providence, took Methodism in Marietta under their protection, and nurtured her as a mother would her first-born. Some of them have long since gone to their reward, while others have grown gray in the good work, and are this day pillars in the church of God.

From this time until 1809, the growth of the church in town and country, was like the well set tree that takes deep root, and promises to stand the pelting storms of coming years. Then the gospel net fell into the hands of a man who drew *good and bad* into the church, but was not careful to separate the *precious* from the

vile. This mismanagement led gainsayers to reproach the ministry with glorying more in quantity than quality; introduced lasting difficulties into the classes; loaded the succeeding pastor with many painful duties, and gave ample testimony that it is less difficult to get bad men into the church than it is to prove their guilt and get them out again, when their good and the interest of the church require it. This reproach being wiped away, by separating the wheat from the chaff, the chasm was filled up by men of the first standing, who gave a weight and influence to Methodism which it never had before in this place. A number of years now passed. The smiles of Heaven rested on the church; and the mighty power that attended the word preached, and the living faith and unshaken confidence of the members in God, made her indeed like an army with banners: and had she kept the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, it is difficult to say to what extent she would by this time have spread her branches. But, alas! men do not know how to value the legacy given to them by Jesus Christ, when he said, 'My peace I give unto you.'

In 1819, the spirit of *disaffection* entered in, and brought with it all its soul-destroying poison. The labours of many years wilted at its unhallowed touch, like herbage before the winter's frost. To see its desolating ravage was enough to break the heart of a good man. In 1825, the old men took an alarm, and gave the next conference a tender but faithful account of their situation; and petitioned the conference to send them some man who would regulate their church matters. The Ohio Conference had felt many fearful apprehensions for Marietta circuit. They took the subject into deep and prayerful consideration; and that indefatigable man, L. S*****, was selected and sent to this circuit, with special orders to examine the state of the church, and to attend to the discipline. He felt the weight of his appointment, flew to God for help, and came in the fulness of the blessing of Christ. His Divine Master was with him, and blessed him in all he did. The Heathen story of the phenix rising to splendour out of its own ashes, would no more than illustrate the change produced in the church on that circuit, under the administration of this highly honoured servant of God.

When alive to God, the church has at all points and at all periods, met her share of opposition; not indeed directly or always from men of high standing, 'but from lowd fellows of the baser sort,' who are frequently the degraded instruments of others acting behind a screen. The spirit of opposition has frequently turned Methodist preachers out of meeting houses belonging to other denominations, and shut public school houses against them, with a manifest intention of putting them down. But in about as many instances, this kind of opposition has had a contrary effect. Instead of putting them down in such places, it has led their friends to double their exertions to build houses of worship for themselves.

In this way the church has frequently gained permanency by the very means intended for her downfall. Under these circumstances, in different neighbourhoods, two or three men of moderate property have been known, with their own funds, in a short time to build houses of worship, to the utter astonishment and confusion of their enemies. If a jealous distance, scowling contempt, and gross misrepresentations, be calculated to inflict wounds, then Methodism has been lacerated often and severely, as well as he who said, 'Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one.'

The system of doctrines held and propagated by the Methodists in Washington county, met a tide of opposition for many years. Its principal antagonists were predestinarians. When Methodism was in its infancy, those men treated its doctrines with the most sovereign contempt; and in its more advanced state, it was scouted out of 'good company' and fine meeting houses, as a *dangerous heresy*. All this time the Methodist ministers were preaching in the flowing language of the Bible, with as much confidence in the correctness of their doctrines, and as great indifference to contempt, and scorn, and opposition, and persecution, as if they knew every being in the universe believed every word they were saying. In this way their sentiments elicited investigation and gained ground daily; until many rallied around their standard. A great conflict of sentiments among the people was the natural consequence. In this state of public excitement, in 1808, the people of Belpre proposed a number of questions, touching those doctrinal points affirmed by Calvinists and denied by Methodists. They called two ministers to discuss those questions in public. Two days were spent in the discussion, and a great concourse of people attended. The Rev. Samuel P. Robins took the affirmative, and the Rev. Solomon Langdon the negative side. Each had his admirers, but no salutary effects were produced either way; for, it is feared, too many came out in the pride of their hearts to see the fight. If the people of Belpre saw the light, they still *loved darkness*; and therefore failed to make a clear distinction between the doctrines of *general redemption* and those of a *particular salvation*. They in consequence blundered into all the errors of modern Universalism. The subject then returned to the people of the county, who have not rendered a verdict in *form*, but have in *effect*. For if it be certain that the ingenious speculations of Descartes were overthrown by the more practical philosophers of the Baconian school, it is not less certain that high-toned Calvinism has suffered the like overthrow from Methodism in this county.

The relative standing of the principal Christian denominations in the county at present, is as follows: The Presbyterians have four ministers, two hundred and forty church members, and five meeting houses—two of them very good, the rest old, unoccupied, and in a decaying state. The Congregationalists employ a Presbyterian minister, have one hundred and eighty church members, and one splendid meeting house. The regular Baptists have one

meeting house, three small congregations, supplied by ministers from a distance, who visit them occasionally. The Methodists have two travelling, and four local preachers, one thousand and twelve members, thirteen meeting houses, and fourteen other stated preaching places, where the congregations meet in school rooms and dwelling houses.* All have their Bible, Missionary, Tract, and Sunday School Societies, doing about what they can to promote the good cause of Christ in the world. When we look over the history of our sister churches, and see what they were once, and what they are now, we are struck with the change that has taken place for the better, and cannot help thinking, that one member of this family has provoked the rest to love and to good works.

Notwithstanding Methodism has been assailed by fierce and contrary winds, like the sea-tossed bark, she has possessed, and still possesses some redeeming principles, which have at all times exerted a saving influence in Washington county. These are,—1st, *Her plan*; by which she meets the wants of the outskirts of human population, as well as the city full;—that sends the gospel to the poor as well as to the rich;—and that distributes the various gifts of the ministry far and wide. Second, *Her doctrines*; which, if fairly explained and properly understood, are calculated not to insult, but to carry conviction to the minds of all attentive and unprejudiced men. Third, *Her manner of preaching*; by which she instructs her ministers to stand at a proper distance, on the one hand, from senseless vociferations, as little calculated to correct the heart as to inform the judgment; and, on the other, from that criminally cold indifference that makes truth look like fiction. Occupying this ground, she encourages them to grasp their subjects in all their extent, and to suffer themselves to be wrought up by a sense of their vast importance to the highest pitch of mental and devotional energy.

‘Then nature speaks
Her genuine language; and the words of men,
Big with the very motion of their souls,
Declare with what accumulated force
Th’ impetuous nerve of feeling urges on
The native weight and energy of things.’

We have seen Methodism in her infancy cast out and trodden under foot;—and we have seen her, in her riper years, put on her beautiful garments, and walk abroad in the greatness of her strength. These things admonish us to ‘rejoice with trembling.’ If God has been with us, and made us a people who were not a people, we should rejoice greatly in the Lord, and incense of praise and gratitude should ascend to him from our feeling hearts, like smoke ascending from an ever burning altar. But if myriads follow and look up to us for the bread of life, we should tremble under a sense of our high responsibility, and the account we must render to our Judge.

* Those meeting houses that belong to every body, that are seldom finished, and are generally a curse to all who have any thing to do with them, are not taken into this account.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. BISHOP GEORGE.

Concluded from page 259.

[METHODISM makes no provision for sinecures ; nor does it hold out any temptation to avarice or ambition, in either the ministry or membership. Such is the construction of its polity, that the highest offices to be filled are loaded with the greatest sacrifices and the most weighty responsibilities. Of this kind is the office of a general superintendent. The support of a bishop, as allowed by the Discipline, is the same as that allowed to any other preacher whose family circumstances and place of living are similar, and no more. But his labours are more abundant. In the discharge of his duties, to travel through the connexion at large, and oversee the affairs of the church, he must be absent from his family, (if he have one,) often for six months together, and sometimes even longer ;—so that he may be said to spend his days at the almost entire sacrifice of domestic enjoyments. In no department of the Christian ministry are men called on, in so plenary a sense, to forsake wife and children, houses and lands, and even their own lives, for the sake of Christ and his gospel, as those are who consent to do the work of an itinerant Methodist bishop ; and that not for a short time only, but during the entire term of their active service in the church. They must bring their minds, therefore, to endure hardship as good soldiers, and perhaps to fall by the hand of death among strangers. They must also take into the account, that the same afflictions await their families in their absence ; sickness and death may make fearful havoc in the tender circle, while the head and principal support is absent. To accept of such an appointment, in view of all these consequences, is, in the fullest sense of the word, to deny one's self, and take up his cross.

But this is not all. The fatigues of travelling, sometimes over bad roads, and with poor accommodations, often having to perform long journeys in a short time, in order to reach the conferences, and consequently to be exposed to the dangers which frequently fall in the way, when long journeys must be performed in a short time, and that at all seasons of the year, and over all kinds of roads ; and the frequent changes of the climate, sometimes altogether ungenial to the constitution ; all these present a catalogue of difficulties to the mind, which no man of sober reflection could consent to encounter but from a sense of duty to God and the church. Besides the sacrifice of domestic comforts, and the fatigues and exposures of travelling, the duties of the office involve the weighty business of presiding in the conferences and stationing the preachers. When it is considered that all the different circuits and stations are to be supplied, and all the appointments to be so arranged as to give each preacher employment in some part of the prescribed work ; that frequent changes are rendered necessary by the economy of the church, and the various claims and circumstances of preachers and people are to be consulted ; and that it is impossible that some

should not be disappointed and afflicted, after wearisome days and sleepless nights have been employed to provide, as far as practicable, for the circumstances and wants of all ;—when all these things are taken into the account, and many more which might be named, there is nothing within the entire range of all the duties and responsibilities which a man of intelligence and feeling could think of consenting to take upon himself, of such weight and importance. No labour can more completely prostrate a man and exhaust his strength, than the constant repetition of such labours as these at the several conferences.

Mr. George was not a stranger to all these things, when he consented to serve the church in the capacity of one of its general superintendents. He accepted this office, as his life and labours abundantly testify, with a due sense of its high duties, and in the spirit of sacrifice.

After his election and consecration, there appears to have been no change in his demeanour. He continued the same faithful and humble servant of God and the church as he was before. To his most intimate friends he never betrayed the least sign of ostentation. No parade of vanity appeared upon the surface, by which one could detect the slightest degree of self complacency at being raised to so high an office ; but rather the reverse. Every thing about him evinced that he felt the weight and responsibility of his calling, and sustained it in the spirit of meekness and humility. His unaffected modesty at all times, and in all companies, the diligent employment of his time, and the solicitude he manifested not to be troublesome to any one, together with his constant concern lest the honor of the cause should suffer for want of skill or industry in those called to fill important places in the church, all demonstrated the humble views he entertained of himself, and the deep interest he felt in promoting the kingdom of the Redeemer.

As he had from the beginning entertained a high sense of the duties and responsibilities of the Christian ministry, his feelings were naturally affected at witnessing any such delinquencies as were calculated to signify that men were capable of entering into the sacred profession rather with a view of promoting their own interests, than of labouring and suffering for Christ's sake, and for the salvation of souls. In the itinerancy he saw an ample field of labour, in which a faithful minister might employ all his time and talents, to the glory of God, and for the good of men. He therefore expected to see those who had entered this field, with the same views and feelings which actuated his own heart, diligently and perseveringly engaged in their work, as long as their circumstances and those of their families would authorize it. Acting constantly under the influence of such a sense of duty, it was his practice to urge the preachers on all occasions to be diligent in their labours. Of this he set them a worthy example.

While his mind was so intensely occupied with a sense of the

duties of the Christian ministry, and a view of the excellency of the itinerant system to render the labours of the ministry available, it was very natural that he should make any occasional delinquencies which came under his observation, a subject of remark in his narrative. An instance occurs in the following paragraph :—]

I now return to my labours, sufferings, and enjoyments. Having commenced my travels on this extensive course, new thoughts and scenes in which I delighted to rove, opened before me. I wondered at what God had done for the people called Methodists, in so few years. I looked upon itinerancy as a vast machine by which God would revolutionize the world, rooting out infidelity, skepticism, and superstition. It originated in benevolence, implanted in the mind of Wesley, and has been kept in operation by the same spirit. Men have charged these institutions with priestcraft and despotism, but I never could discover either. When I have pursued this subject I have supposed that if this engine were propelled by the united energies of the church, we might as easily increase fifty thousand every year as ten thousand. But the sacrifices it requires will not be made ! Men seek earthly honors, wealth, and pleasure, instead of following Him whose whole life was employed in doing good. They think it hard to receive nothing but a crown of glory at the end ! Many valuable men, from the necessity of providing for their own household, have left the connexion, and served us in a local sphere. Others have become dissatisfied and ‘departed from the work,’ and have spread their spirit of discontent as far as their influence extended. My observations on this subject have occasioned much anguish of mind ; I might have said with David, ‘It was not an enemy that reproached us ; then could I have borne it : neither was it he that hated us that did magnify himself against us ; then would I have hid myself from him : but it was thou, a man mine equal, my guide, my friend, and my brother.’

And for what ? Why, a temporizing spirit. O this has been the curse of the church in all ages ! This *mystery of iniquity* which began to work in the primitive church, in Ananias and Sapphira, has wrought to this day, and unless the Lord of hosts had left us a remnant, we should all have been corrupted. How unlike the spirit of Jesus, who died the just for the unjust that he might bring us to God ; or his holy apostles, who declined no cross, no suffering, so that they might win souls to Christ ! What apostles would the time servers of the present day have made ! However, I thank God I found hundreds among the travelling and the local preachers

‘ Whose hearts are warm,
Whose hands are pure, whose doctrine and whose life
Coincident, exhibit lucid proof
That they are honest in the sacred cause.’

These men laboured not for ‘filthy lucre’s sake,’ but for ‘Jesus’ sake,’ and were emphatically the servants of mankind. And while

others had 'bitter envying and strife,' they dwelt in a 'quiet habitation.' 'The word of the Lord' in them 'had free course: it ran' and 'was glorified.'

These faithful ministers have cheered my spirits in many a dark and gloomy hour, in the 'wilderness and solitary place,' when contending with the elements, and suffering the pressures of hunger, and cold, and weariness.

In the midst of these great and manifold enjoyments, my spirits have been often bowed down by the infirmities of my brethren. I travelled hundreds of miles to preside in the annual conferences, where, according to our established order, every man's character must be examined, as to his moral and ministerial conduct. This is done by calling their names over one by one, that if any complaints or charges are to be made, the accuser and accused may come face to face, and such explanations and concessions be given as shall satisfy the conference, and the aggrieved brother. But I have often seen with pain and regret that Satan has taken the advantage of some, and magnified infirmities, which the most rigid casuists could not construe into immorality, into heinous offences. Is not this a violation of that charity which 'suffereth long and is kind; seeketh not her own, and is not easily provoked; thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity; beareth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things, and never faileth?' Does not this law of kindness enjoin us, 'if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such a one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself lest thou also be tempted?' 'He which converteth the sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins.' The 'carnal mind' has always produced fruit opposite to this.

The glorious gospel of the blessed God, as revealed in the holy Scriptures, and explained and enforced by Mr. Wesley and his successors, eradicates every evil temper, and implants in their stead every heavenly disposition, 'bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ.' This religion has filled me with 'joy and gladness.' Its triumphs are seen in the joyful experience, in life and death, of Christ's faithful disciples. Survey them in *life*. They are delivered from the dread of death. To them he is become a messenger of peace. They are 'blessed with all heavenly blessings in Christ.' They enjoy that pardoning mercy which gives them confidence in God; they receive that sanctifying agency which purifies their nature, and fits them for his presence; they possess, in that faith which is the 'substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen,' a delightful anticipation of their future triumphs. Let their faith be in vigorous exercise, and nothing intimidates them. They are prepared to join in the holy exultations of St. Paul: 'Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God who justifieth; who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is

even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or the sword?—Nay in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded that neither life, nor death, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.'

View the disciples of Jesus in *death*! It is then that their principles and hopes are brought to the severest test. Nothing can be more convincing to the careless, or encouraging to the pious, than the dying triumphs of a Christian. When the unceasing pressure of pain tortures, and strength fails, and the spirits ebb; when all earthly things recede, and the solemn light of eternity dawns; when the last agonies rend asunder the soul and body;—to see the man under such circumstances, smiling amid the ruins of dissolving nature, committing himself without fear or dismay to his ever-living Redeemer, and in effect saying to death, under whose influence he seems to sink, 'Rejoice not against me, O mine enemy: when I fall I shall arise;'—it is then, and under such circumstances, that the power of religion is displayed.

'How our hearts burnt within us at the scene!
His God sustains him in his final hour!
His final hour brings glory to his God!
Man's glory Heaven vouchsafes to call her own.
We gaze! we weep mixt tears of grief and joy!
Amazement strikes! devotion bursts to flame!
Christians adore! and infidels believe.'

By many such scenes as this, in the course of **THIRTY** years, I have been strengthened, and encouraged to spend the evening of my days in explaining and enforcing these blessed doctrines.

When I have 'pondered them in my heart,' I have wondered how rational beings, with the volume of nature and the oracles of God open before them, could object to any of them, and especially to that of *Christian perfection*. If we look into the kingdom of nature we shall behold every thing in progress to its perfection. 'For the earth bringeth forth fruit: first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear.' This principle prevails from the towering oak, the ornament of the forest, down to the 'meanest flowret of the vale.' In animated nature, birds, beasts, fishes, insects, and reptiles, advance to their perfection. In arts and sciences among civilized nations, the same laws exist. The God of grace has made the same gradations in the plan of redemption. Penitent believers are justified, regenerated, sanctified, and finally glorified. 'Whom God called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified.' Christians are 'little children, young men, and fathers.' The portrait is finished, one feature

after another, until it attains 'the fulness of a man in Christ Jesus.'

'The holy to the holiest leads ;
From thence our spirits rise ;
And he that in thy statutes treads,
Shall meet thee in the skies.'

There, those who are 'perfect and entire, wanting nothing,' shall enter and dwell for ever. 'And there shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie ; but they that are written in the Lamb's book of life.' I desire not to be uncharitable on this subject, nor to judge the motives of others ; but I have been much disquieted to hear men of genius, zeal, and eloquence, and professedly friends of evangelical principles, spending their powers in decrying this sublime and scriptural doctrine, although they are compelled to acknowledge that 'without holiness no man shall see the Lord.' And some at least I fear persist in advocating the necessity of sin, because they love its pleasures, and the company of sinners !

[Here the account left by Bishop George, of his life and experience, abruptly closes. Considering the important place he occupied in the church, the extent and the intensity of his labours, and the light in which his name must stand in the history of Methodism, it were ardently to be wished that he had extended his narrative through the history of his travels as a general superintendent, down to his last fatal illness. During the first eight years of his superintendency, which commenced in May 1816, we have no record of the incidents of his life, and the extent of his labours and usefulness, either from himself or any one else. But he was among us, and was always to be found where the duties of his office called him. The entire work of the superintendency rested at that time upon three bishops ; and as there was no regular division of it, they were called to travel over the whole continent, in order to meet the several conferences. Bishop George was accustomed, in travelling from one conference to another, to visit the societies, and preach wherever an opportunity offered. Wherever he was at any given time, those who were with him can testify to his diligent labours, and patient sufferings in the cause of the Redeemer. But the details of those labours and sufferings must remain to be developed in their due form and order, in that day when wisdom shall be justified of her children.]

At the General Conference in 1824, the Rev. Joshua Soule, and the Rev. Elijah Hedding, were elected and ordained as additional bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The number then consisted of five, viz. Rev. Messrs. M'Kendree, George, Roberts, Soule, and Hedding. In consideration of Bishop M'Kendree's state of health, the General Conference of 1824 respectfully requested that he would continue to afford such aid to the episcopacy as he himself might judge consistent with his age and

infirmities, and when and where it might best suit his own convenience.

By a mutual arrangement among the bishops, the general work was temporarily divided, and the northern and eastern section, with the Pittsburgh and Ohio Conferences, fell under the superintendence of Bishops George and Hedding. The latter has kindly furnished us with a general outline of the travels and labours of his senior colleague after that period. He speaks of Bishop George in the singular, although for some time they travelled together.

From the General Conference in 1824, which was held in Baltimore, he proceeded to the city of New-York, where he attended the New-York Annual Conference, in June. Thence he proceeded, through Connecticut and Massachusetts, to Barnard in Vermont, where he attended the New-England Conference, in the latter part of the same month. From the New-England Conference he made his way to the Genesee Conference, which was held at Lansing, in the western part of the state of New-York, in the month of July. In August he attended the Canada Conference, at Hallowell, U. C. After the Canada Conference, and visiting the societies in the province, he directed his course to the south, and spent the severity of the winter in Maryland and the neighbouring states.

At the opening of the spring in 1825, he commenced his tour again to the north, and in April attended the Philadelphia Conference, in the city of Philadelphia. Thence he proceeded up the west side of the Hudson river, visiting in his way the societies which are spread through that valley, and which, from their location, are seldom indulged with such a favor, and, on the 3d of May, met the New-York Annual Conference in the city of Troy. After conference he proceeded down the east side of the Hudson river, through Hudson and Rhinebeck, as far as Poughkeepsie, and thence across by the way of Hartford, Connecticut, to Cambridge, Mass., where he attended the New-England Conference in June. In July he attended the Maine Conference at Gardiner, in the state of Maine. From this conference he proceeded on his western tour, in company with Bishop Hedding, to the western part of the state of New-York, where they separated. He attended the Pittsburgh and Ohio Conferences, and Bishop Hedding those of Genesee and Canada.

After the Ohio Conference, which was held in September, he directed his course again to the east, and, passing the heart of the winter in the middle states, met the Philadelphia Conference in April 1826. He took in his route the New-York, New-England, and Maine Conferences, the last of which was held at Bucksport, on the Penobscot river, in the month of July. From Maine, he went across the upper country, into Canada, and attended the Canada Conference at Coburg, U. C., in August or September.

In April 1827, we find him again in the Philadelphia Conference,

which held its session in Smyrna, in the state of Delaware; and in May in the New-York Conference, at Troy, N. Y. This year he did not pursue his usual route to the east, but went directly from Troy to the Genesee Conference, which sat in Wilkesbarre, Pa., in June. Thence he proceeded to meet the Pittsburgh Conference, at Steubenville, Ohio, and the Ohio Conference, at Cincinnati.

After attending these conferences, he passed again through the middle country, and reached New-York in the latter part of January 1828. He employed himself in visiting the societies, and preaching in the neighbourhood of New-York and Brooklyn, until April, when he returned to attend the Philadelphia Conference. From the Philadelphia Conference he proceeded in company with Bishop Hedding to attend the General Conference, which commenced its session in Pittsburgh, Pa., on the first day of May 1828. After the General Conference, he returned again to the city of New-York, to attend the New-York Annual Conference, which commenced its session in that city on the 25th of June.

According to an arrangement of the bishops, entered into at the General Conference of 1828, it fell to his lot, next in succession, to attend the southern conferences. For this purpose he set out immediately after the close of the New-York Conference. The first account we have respecting him, after he left New-York, on his way to the Holstein Conference, in East Tennessee, is contained in a letter from the Rev. Basil Barry, addressed to the editors of the *Christian Advocate and Journal*, in which it is stated that he preached in Harrisonburgh, Va., on Sabbath the 30th of August. The next day he arrived in Staunton, in the same state, and was ill of dysentery. He said his complaint had so much affected him as to oblige him frequently to lie down on the road. He retired to his chamber without having a physician called, hoping that after a little rest he would be better. But as his complaint continued, medical assistance was afterward obtained.

On Thursday the 14th, while several brethren were sitting with him, he said, 'Brethren, you must excuse me; I am too weak to talk to you. All I can say is, if I die I am going to glory! For this I have been living forty years!'

On Friday he sent for the preacher in charge of the circuit, the Rev. B. Barry, and stated to him that as he was low, if he should die he wished him to be the bearer of a few lines to two friends in Baltimore, who were charged with the settlement of his affairs. He then requested to have the fourteenth and fifteenth chapters of the gospel by St. John read. After hearing them read, he took occasion to remark upon the sentiments contained in them, and exclaimed in conclusion, 'What a body of divinity and valuable truth is contained in those chapters!' His prospects of heaven appeared to fill his soul with joy and peace.

On observing a backwardness in him to take medicine, his

friend, who communicated these facts, said to him, 'Father George, I do not wish you to die.' 'Why?' he replied, 'do you not wish me to go to heaven from Staunton?'

It appears that after this he had some expectation of a favorable termination of his complaint, as he would frequently say to the brethren who attended him, 'We will try and get into the country;' and on Wednesday the 20th, arrangements were made for that purpose; but he was too weak to ride. He appeared to suffer much pain; though he endured it with great patience. On Thursday evening about six o'clock he said, 'I now feel that a change has taken place,' which so alarmed his friends that they immediately sent and called in three physicians. But he was beyond the aid of human skill. The number of his days was filled, and his change was at hand. As in the days of his strength and vigour, so in the last feeble pulsations of life, 'glory! glory!' was his theme. To his attendant physician he said, 'I shall soon be in glory!' In the ecstasy of his feelings he appears to have been greatly abstracted from the world, and absorbed in meditations on the enjoyment of the society of glorified spirits,—so much so as to have lost himself in the raptures of the glory just ready to break upon him, if he were not really favored with a vision of angelic attendants; as he said to a friend, 'Who are these? are they not all ministering spirits?—my dear departed wife has been with me, and I shall soon be with her in glory!'

On Friday morning, as some brethren entered the room to see him, he raised his arms to embrace them, and said, 'Brethren, rejoice with me; I am going to glory!' During the day he frequently repeated this triumphant exclamation, 'I am going to glory! that is enough!'—It appears that his joys continued to increase throughout the day, until in the overflowing of his feelings he clapped his hands and exclaimed, 'Shout glory to God! the best of all is, God is with us!'

He requested to be left alone through the night. Being asked if he had any temporal business to settle, he replied, 'Nothing of magnitude,' and added, 'I am going to glory! I have been many years trying to lead others to glory, and now thither I am going. For me to live is Christ, but to die is gain. Jesus is precious.' At six o'clock next morning, Saturday, August 23, 1828, he died in the triumph of that faith which he had long preached to others. Thus was this great man of God suddenly called from the walls of Zion to his reward in heaven. How unsearchable are the judgments of God, and his ways past finding out.

In the biographies of most eminent men, there is a period when we contemplate them as at the meridian of their greatness, and thenceforward follow them through successive changes, sometimes into shades of obscurity and distress, before the night of death overtakes them. But in perusing the history of Bishop George, we are spared the pain of descending through a catalogue of

adverse incidents,—the loss of the confidence of his friends, a depreciation of talents and usefulness, and such other events as are calculated to shed a gloom over the feelings of the benevolent reader. From the eminence to which he had ascended by a steady step, and where he was manfully and successfully fighting the battles of the Lord, he fell, to use a favorite phrase of his own, ‘covered with glory!’

As Bishop George was well known to the ministry and membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church generally, it might at first seem superfluous to attempt a description of his person, his religious deportment, and his talents. The reader, however, who had the happiness of an acquaintance with him, will bear in mind that the name and labours of Bishop George will hold a prominent place in the history of American Methodism; and that posterity, and those also among the living who will not have had the pleasure of knowing him personally, will feel a peculiar interest in surveying such a portrait. This consideration, it is believed, will justify appending a few remarks of this kind, familiar as the subject of them may be to most of our present readers. A description of the Bishop’s person is deemed the more particularly desirable, as we believe he never could be induced to allow any likeness of himself to be taken, and we think there is none extant.

Bishop George was a man of an interesting personal appearance, especially for the grave profession of the ministry. He was about five feet ten inches high; the frame of his body was large and well proportioned, with somewhat of an inclination to corpulence; and he appeared every way formed for physical strength and energy. When standing, whether in conversation or otherwise, he usually maintained a very erect posture, with his hands thrown behind him; but when walking, he inclined a little forward, with his hands in the same position, and moved with a short quick step.

The aspect of his countenance, as well as the frame of his body, impressed the beholder with an idea of strength and energy. His face was broad; the forehead prominent, and well spread; the nose large and rather flat; the eyes of a blue cast, and deep set in their sockets; the eyebrows dark and considerably projected; the mouth and lips in due proportion with the other features of the face: a full suit of hair, dark and mixed with grey, rather neglected, yet graceful, hung about his neck; and his complexion, which was once probably fair, had become sallow, through excessive exposures and fatigues. Whatever impression his strongly marked countenance might have been calculated to give, had it been moulded by the internal workings of corrupt and malignant passions, in the light of the holy affections which beamed in it, there were charms displayed which rendered it lovely, and will impress the image of it indelibly on the affectionate remembrance of his numerous friends who had the pleasure of his acquaintance.

His body and mind were symmetrically constituted with a re-

markable adaptation to each other. Like the former, the latter was fashioned after an enlarged model. Under all circumstances it appeared to be of an original cast and independent bearing. He was every where the thinking, active agent, rather than the sequestered, plodding theorist. All his powers were employed in carrying into effect such measures of practical utility as he deemed best calculated to promote the cause of Christ. *To do*, was, in fact, his motto; and no man ever adhered more strictly and perseveringly to the true import of it. Every thing about him, mind or body, was energy. He thought rapidly, spoke fluently, decided promptly, and permitted nothing in which he was engaged to hang heavily upon his hands. He detested tardiness, as the murderer of time; and never failed to signify his disapprobation of a dull and languid course of proceeding in the transaction of business, or of unimportant discussions calculated to retard its progress. Wherever he was, every thing with which he had any connexion was destined to feel the impulse of his propelling energies.

Although he was accustomed, in the discharge of his official and ministerial duties, to press on with so much force and energy, in order that every thing might be done within the time allotted for its accomplishment, and might seem, under such circumstances, to betray at times a hurry of spirit, yet he was a man in whom the grace of patience shone with peculiar lustre. When he was called to endure inconveniencies whose tendency was only to deprive him of his personal comforts, though occasioned by the culpable neglect or mismanagement of others, no man could sustain them with a better temper than he did. As an instance of this, when travelling from the south to meet the New-York Annual Conference, some four or five years before his death, the steamboat in the Chesapeake was run aground early in the evening, and abandoned by the master, who gave no information to the passengers respecting their prospects of getting off; in consequence of which they had no rest during the night, and their ultimate removal from the boat was rendered both unpleasant and dangerous. The failure of another boat detained the company half the day in waiting for the carriages. When, on the following day, they arrived in sight of the boat which they supposed was to bring them into New-York, they were informed that they could not go on board until the arrival of a carriage which had been detained by some of the passengers, who refused to come on until they could have time to get refreshment. This detention prevented the company who had been brought on in the regular course of the line, from receiving any refreshment until late in the evening. After all these perplexing occurrences, which very much annoyed the feelings of the passengers, they were informed that they must prepare to exchange boats before their arrival at New-York, in consequence of which they were deprived of rest that night also, and brought into the city at a most unseasonable hour. All these inconveniences, a

part of which at least were not deemed unavoidable, occasioned incessant murmurs and complaints from many of the passengers. They were indeed peculiarly calculated to discompose and irritate their feelings. But Bishop George appeared calm and pleasant throughout the whole. No expressions of complaining or impatience were discovered in any thing he said or did. With a happy composure of mind he appeared engaged in endeavouring to render all pleasant around, without seeming to regard the delays and inconveniencies they were suffering. The same meek and quiet spirit was manifest in all his conduct among his friends, and especially in the families in which he spent his time during his visits in any place. This trait of character, for which he was eminent, rendered him one of the most pleasant guests that could be desired. The most diffident and unpretending, on becoming acquainted with him, could not but feel themselves relieved from all that embarrassing restraint which the presence of a less humble and courteous visiter is calculated to impose.

Bishop George was a deeply experienced Christian. According to his own account of himself, he embraced religion in early life; and we have no intimation that he ever, at any time, wavered in his course. In his riper years he certainly appeared always to be 'servent in spirit, serving the Lord.' Having united himself to the Methodist Episcopal Church, whose doctrines and discipline best accorded with his views of the gospel, he continued strictly to adhere to the general rules, and faithfully to support the institutions, of that Church. In public worship he was devout and ardent, and always appeared joyful in the house of God. In attending to the ordinances, and especially the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, he was sometimes so enraptured that he would shout aloud.

He was strictly attentive to the duty of private prayer, and ardent in it, sometimes wrestling and struggling as in an agony, for a long time together, as though he was unwilling to leave the throne of grace until he had obtained an evidence that his petition was accepted. In travelling he often found it inconvenient to attend to this duty, in consequence of being pressed for time, lodging at public houses, or being in families where he could not well retire without a liability to interruption. Under such circumstances he was accustomed to retire to some grove very early in the morning, and during the twilight of evening, usually taking a friend with him when one was at hand. Whoever has been favored with the privilege of accompanying him on such occasions, can testify to the ardour of his devotions, and the fervency of his spirit, while breathing out his soul in prayer to God. 'This,'—he used to say, when returning from the sequestered spot he had chosen for prayer, and walking slowly through the grove with a cheerful countenance and renewed vigour of soul,—'this is the principal relief and comfort my poor soul receives in the midst of my incessant travels and constant pressure of business.' To walk

abroad and meditate, in the evening, was his uniform practice, whenever the place and his engagements allowed.

Bishop George was a firm believer in the doctrines of the church with which he was connected, and ardently advocated them, in view both of their accordance with the Scriptures, and their practical efficacy in promoting pure and undefiled religion. It is not to be understood from this remark, however, that he was distinguished as a polemic. Quite the reverse. We do not know that he ever entered into a controversy of magnitude with any person of a different persuasion; and he seldom troubled himself in his preaching with the creeds and peculiarities of others, only in so far as he considered them to contravene the influence of such truths as he wished to enforce upon the hearts and consciences of his hearers, or to retard and repress the spirit of revival in the church. If he ever attacked the opinions of others with severity, they were those which, in his view, had a tendency to lower the standard of Christian experience, and encourage a form without the power of religion. Holiness of heart and life, as inculcated by Mr. Wesley and his coadjutors, was his constant theme, in public and private. He himself appeared to be richly laden with the ripe fruits of such a mature experience; and he felt a deep concern that all who named the name of Christ might enjoy it. He therefore urged all to press after it; and rejoiced when he found any, preachers or people, giving good evidence that they enjoyed, or were earnestly seeking it. It was his constant care to keep the attention of the preachers alive to the importance of promoting revivals of religion, by labouring diligently to stir up the minds of the people in every place, and cherishing in their own hearts a holy ardour for the prosperity of Zion. A long series of observations had convinced him, that the prosperity, if not the very existence of pure religion, depended upon these visitations of the Spirit, which, with all their salutary effects upon the hearts and lives of men, are denounced by even some professors of the Christian faith, in terms of obloquy and reproach. To learn, therefore, that a work of revival was in progress in any place, ever appeared to afford him unspeakable satisfaction. This engrossed all his feelings, so much so that when he wrote to the preachers, or occasionally met them, the all-absorbing question was, 'How does the work of religion prosper? have you any awakenings and conversions among you?'

Although Bishop George was a man of ardent religious feelings, they were kept under the control of a calm and sober judgment. His most fervent expressions of animation and ardour were solid and weighty, and contained in them none of that frothy effervescence which characterizes a zeal without knowledge. He was a *consistent*, as well as a *lively* and *animated* Christian. He had a correct and discriminating taste, and would receive only what was food for the soul, while he discarded what vitiated appetites would

seize with eagerness, and greedily devour: Among other instances which might be selected as evidence of this fact, the writer had the pleasure of witnessing the following. An enthusiastic admirer of the ditties circulated under the title of 'campmeeting hymns,' once took occasion, in the presence of the bishop, to castigate a preacher for not circulating the 'campmeeting hymn books' in preference to the regular 'Methodist hymn book.' The air with which he commenced the attack clearly indicated that he expected the bishop would join with him, and would administer a just reproof to the cold-hearted preacher, as he deemed him to be, for not encouraging the people to buy those 'excellent little books,' and learning all those 'lively hymns and tunes, that they might sing with the spirit.' But to his great disappointment and mortification, the bishop turned the reproof upon the complainant, and his companions who were standing by; and exposed, in his own vivid style and manner, the insipidity of those 'sing-songs' (as he called them) which they so much admired, when compared with the deeply devotional and truly poetic hymns contained in our hymnbook, and their tendency to pervert the taste of their admirers, and to foster feelings prejudicial to the advancement of a sound religious experience. These well-timed remarks had a salutary effect, and the more so because it brought those to whom they were addressed to see, what they had not before suspected, that even the ardour of Bishop George might consist with a refined taste, and a sober judgment.

Bishop George studied to avoid all occasions of unprofitable conversation. His mind must necessarily have been burthened with much care. This, with the time taken up in travelling, and that which he required for study, meditation, and private devotions; left very little for other purposes. He was accustomed, therefore, wherever he happened to be, to avoid, as much as possible, the company of all, except such as had business with him. He would spend his hours of relaxation very cheerfully in the families where he lodged, and sometimes with one or two visitors, so long as he perceived that he could command both his own time, and the profitable order of the conversation. But he knew, as he passed from place to place, that there were individuals too apt to indulge in trivial and unimportant conversation, and to forget the embarrassments and inconveniences to which such a waste of time would every day have rendered him liable, had he yielded to encourage the practice. He was, moreover, as he has intimated, averse to the asking of common-place questions, which he found visitors of this kind very forward to do. His own language, as it may be found in the commencement of his narrative, will best illustrate his views on this subject. Regarding his own peace and quiet, therefore, and the improvement of his time, as well as what he thought would be most profitable for others, he usually retired whenever collections came together where he was, under circumstances to

induce an opinion that the object was barely to while away an idle hour. Although this was not well received by some, yet those who were capable of viewing it in all its bearings, were prepared, on due reflection, not only to excuse, but, indeed, to commend it. The pertinacity with which he adhered to this practice, occasioned him sometimes to retire at the coming in of strangers, with whose company he might otherwise have been pleased and profited.—Such events he regretted. But the greater loss which he must have sustained by changing his course, he considered to overbalance any consideration arising from such occasional occurrences in favor of doing so. In the midst of all his weighty concerns of a public nature, he felt the need of time for attending to his own soul. And that he would not be interrupted in this, may safely be construed as evidence of the ardent devotion and deep piety of his heart.

As a minister, his vows rested upon him with all the force of moral obligation. Order was, in his view, the grand object of all just governments; and subordination to the regularly constituted authorities, he deemed essential to order. He considered the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of ministers, to be reciprocal; and that their duties were to be performed, whatever place they were called to fill in the church, in strict compliance with the rules laid down in the Discipline. Hence, as junior preacher, preacher in charge, presiding elder, or general superintendent, he acted in conformity to the general directions given to preachers in the Discipline;—such as, ‘Be diligent. Never be unemployed. Never be triflingly employed. Do not mend our rules, but keep them,’ and all of a like import. In each place separately he also regarded the duties of his place and office, as specified in the Discipline, in the light of a contract by which he had solemnly engaged to be bound. Before he entered the travelling connexion formally, when he was employed by Bishop Asbury to take a circuit, and afterward had a desire to leave it, but could not obtain the consent of the preacher in charge, he says, he ‘abhorred the idea of relinquishing his post dishonourably,’ and adds, ‘When a man is charged with a duty involving high and holy responsibilities, he should “stand fast,” though he even suffer and die in the discharge of it.’ This high sense of moral obligation may be traced through his whole life. In all the higher offices he filled in the church, he seemed to consider himself as pledged to perform the duties appropriated to that office, in the spirit of order, and as the servant of his brethren. This spirit of unostentatious conformity to rule and order, was indeed among those striking traits of character by which he was so eminently qualified for the high office which he ultimately filled.

As a General Superintendent, he maintained a prudent, dignified, and uniform course. With such exceptions as distinguished merit must always expect to be taxed with, his administration was gene-

rally approved by the ministry and membership of the church. The testimonial of the Rev. Richard Reece, late delegate from the British to the American General Conference, whose judgment of men and measures is deservedly held in high estimation in both countries, will be accorded with by the feelings of all Bishop George's friends, who were in any considerable degree conversant with him in his official capacity. Mr. Reece says :—

‘My acquaintance with that venerable man [Bishop George] commenced at the Winchester [Baltimore] Conference, where he presided. Shortly afterward I had frequent and unreserved intercourse with him, at the Philadelphia Conference. I admired his character. I thought I saw in him — wisdom — blended with harmlessness —. Integrity, and zeal to extend the kingdom of Christ; love of the brethren, and generous compassion for the weak, were striking features in his episcopal character.’

In making out the appointments for the preachers, it is not to be expected that any man can give universal satisfaction. The utmost that can be looked for is, that those on whom the business devolves do the best they can. If there be some circuits and stations harder than others, they must, nevertheless, be supplied. And there can be little personal gratification in being charged with the duty and responsibility of selecting the men for such places. Regard must also be had to the qualifications of men for particular places. Whoever may envy this work, as an object of ambition, to a man of refined sensibilities it can be performed only from a sense of duty to God and the church. Those who have acted with Bishop George in this matter, can testify with how much tenderness he was accustomed to consult the situation of preachers and their families, (after the interests of the church, which were always the primary object,) and the deep concern with which he would review his plan, and take counsel, in order to avoid settling any appointment which he had reason to fear would be seriously inconvenient.

It is true, such complaints, from preachers or people, as he considered to be merely captious, or the result of hasty indiscretion, he treated with coolness, and sometimes, when he thought they merited it, even with rebuke. He considered a Methodist travelling preacher as entering the itinerant field in the spirit of sacrifice, with the single object of doing all the good in his power, and with feelings prepared to brook difficulties and inconveniences, for the accomplishment of that object. In regard to any complaints or appeals, therefore, which indicated a want of such feelings, and a disposition to seek accommodation rather than the good of the cause, in whatever shape or under whatever pretence they came, he was firm and invincible; and also in regard to complaints, on the other hand, respecting the preachers, when he knew or had full evidence to believe those complaints to be ill founded and unreasonable. But in all other cases, it was his chief concern to accommodate all, to the utmost extent of his ability.

In passing through the districts embraced within the several annual conferences, he was accustomed to mark with a vigilant eye the introduction of any thing which might be, in his view, of a deleterious tendency, or the existence of things which required the attention of the members of the particular conference where they existed; and then, at his leisure, to communicate his thoughts thereon by letter, addressing a copy to each of the presiding elders within the bounds of that conference, and thus, through the presiding elders, to the preachers and people in their several districts. We have several of these letters before us. The subjects embraced in the greater part of them have been noticed in the foregoing observations, and need not be repeated. We have only this general remark to make respecting them, that, besides the particular subject or subjects which each one was intended to introduce to the notice and attention of those concerned, the tone and tendency of the whole of them aimed at inculcating holiness of heart and life, in both the ministry and membership of the church. We furnish the following as a sample of the description of letters above alluded to. It was addressed to the Rev. Daniel Ostrander, then presiding elder of the Saratoga district, within the New-York Annual Conference:—

‘JUNE 26, 1822.

My dear brother :—Since we parted at the New-York Conference, my mind has been variously and painfully exercised in reflecting on the state of our finances, especially when I see the invalids of your conference, hanging on the labouring oar that they may gain a small pittance, when their labours are such that they must feel themselves oppressed, and after their utmost toils, they find they are not able to satisfy either themselves or their friends.

When we see the aged tottering under the pressure of infirmity and poverty, and the effective labourers coming to conference with such limited supplies, and nothing comparatively speaking on the conference table to supply their wants, and the wants of their suffering wives and distressed children, my question is, Shall we slumber any longer at our posts? Is it not time for our sympathies, our zeal, and all our powers to awake up?

I am disposed to conclude that you are ready to help in any and every way you can; but your question will be, What can we do?

Permit me to recommend to your consideration, and also for the consideration of the preachers within your district, the following plans, hoping by this means your minds may be made up by the next Annual Conference.

That is to say, let us in the first place have a preacher's fund established, that we may have it in our power to show charity and mercy to our distressed brethren. For we know it is said by him who is infallible, that the merciful shall obtain mercy, and if we expect mercy and charity to be extended to us, let us that mercy

and charity to others show ; and should it only be the widow's mite, yet the Lord of glory will honor us with his smiles.

But the principal plan to which I would call the attention of yourself and others is this, viz. the establishment of a cent collection throughout the bounds of the whole conference, in which we may appoint suitable persons to open a book for the purpose, and invite any and all persons, whether in or out of the society, who are willing to help our itinerant and missionary cause, to give us one cent a week, paid either monthly, quarterly, or annually, and let the said collector give credit to the donors, and send the money to the conference annually.

My opinion is, that if we could unite and persevere in this business generally, we should have enough to supply our deficiencies, and send the gospel among the destitute who are now inviting us in town and country.

While we are thus labouring for a small pittance to help us through this life, let us keep steady to our cardinal point, pleading for, and promoting holiness of heart and life. Warm, zealous hearts will sympathize with, and help us. Cold, frozen, and barren hearts will spurn us, and leave us to perish.

I am pleased to find that my brethren in the ministry and membership, in your conference, are making such united efforts in favor of holiness.

Go on, my brethren, in the name of Him who said, "Be ye holy, for I am holy," and you *shall* prosper.

I remain your affectionate friend and brother in Christ,

ENOCH GEORGE.'

The subject of this letter requires a few remarks. Bishop George was opposed to the institution of funds for the support of the gospel, as an ordinary provision. We are perfectly well acquainted with his sentiments on this point. He considered the duty of those who receive the gospel, in the way the Lord has ordained, to be clearly laid down in the Scriptures, viz. to provide for the comfortable support of those who preach it. He perceived that in the establishment of permanent funds for this purpose, two evils were involved. In the first place they were usually instituted with terms and conditions, intended to restrict those who should have the benefit of them, to the views of the contributors'; and, in the second place, wherever such funds were instituted, they would exempt the future generation from the obligation of supporting the gospel, which would have an evil tendency in many ways. He therefore strenuously maintained the doctrine, that it was the duty of the people to provide for the support of the ministers labouring among them, and to leave the same duty to be performed by their children. It is not to be understood, therefore, that any allusion was had in the foregoing letter to the establishment of funds for the ordinary and permanent support of the gospel.

There were two circumstances that came under his observation which excited his benevolent feelings, and invited his attention to a consideration of this subject. The first was the peculiar situation of the superannuated preachers, widows, and orphans, in regard to support ; and his suggestions respecting a fund were intended to be applied to the destitute of this class, together with particular cases of distress among the labouring preachers, beyond the reach of any ordinary provision made for their support. We have already had occasion to notice how tenderly his feelings were affected on this point ; and hence, when at some periods he could no longer labour himself, and conceived that by teaching a school he might support himself, he waived his claim on the meagre funds which were the sole dependence of others who could neither labour in the ministry, or otherwise. Hence also he often signified, as is intimated in the letter we have quoted, his dissatisfaction that men who had performed but little active service in the church, and were able to provide means of support for themselves and families, (by some honorable employment,) or were themselves possessed of such means, should hang upon the conference, when they could not effectually subserve the interests of the church. The remark contained in the letter respecting invalids, was by no means intended to apply to the whole of that class, but to such only as he considered to be of the description above named, and in whatever conference they might be. He did not, indeed, pretend to question the legality of their claims, as founded in the conventional regulations of the church ; but he had a desire that all such should feel the mercy due to their suffering brethren, and exercise that mercy toward them.

To show the consistency of his views in favor of the institution of a fund for this specific purpose, while, for the ordinary support of the gospel he was opposed to the funding policy altogether, it may be necessary to remark, that the aged preachers who have expended all their time and strength in the service of the church, and the widows and orphans of deceased preachers, rarely receive more than from twenty to forty per cent. on the dollar, of the amount allowed them by Discipline, and no consideration whatever for house rent or table expenses ; they are not among the people as the preachers regularly labouring in their circuits and stations are, and are not, therefore, in a situation to receive any part of what is raised immediately for the support of the gospel among them ; yet, having spent all in the service of the church, stern justice demands that provision should be made for them. In this case, the institution of a fund, for such purposes, involves none of the evils above named.

The other circumstance which invited Bishop George's attention to this subject, was the difficulty of sustaining the work in the poorer sections of it. While he perceived that in the most flourishing and wealthy parts of the country, it appeared to require exertion on the part of the stewards to raise a support for the preachers

labouring among them, so that, with few exceptions, they were deficient in their allowance even there, those preachers who were sent to the poorer sections received comparatively nothing; and many places where the gospel might be rendered efficacious, could not be furnished for want of means. To provide for the relief of such as were willing to preach the gospel to the poor, and endure all the inconveniencies and sufferings of travelling and labouring among them, asking only a morsel to sustain their families, he suggested the plan of a 'cent collection.' He believed that our friends had both the ability and disposition, if the subject were only brought before them in some well digested and systematic form. In this we must think he manifested as well the correctness of his judgment, as the benevolence of his heart; and it is to be hoped that these suggestions, by which, though dead, he yet speaketh, will not be altogether lost.

As a preacher, Bishop George was a burning and shining light. He was possessed of rare and commanding talents for a public speaker. His voice was strong, yet sweet and musical, and incomparably adapted to grave and pathetic subjects. These captivating and attracting peculiarities gave to his ecstatic effusions, in which he abounded, an air of solemnity which apathy itself could not resist. Nothing could be calculated more effectually to touch the feelings of the human heart, to wither the shoots of pride springing up in it, and to melt down its hardness, than was the strain of original eloquence which characterized the preaching of this excellent man. Originality was, indeed, a prominent feature of his preaching. Endowed with all the qualifications which are necessary to constitute an impressive natural public speaker, he imitated no one, and drew always from his own resources. The ornaments and flowers which embellished his sermons were not gleaned from the fields and gardens cultivated by any scientific master; but were the natural production of his own fertile mind. His style was a mixture of the sublime and the pathetic, and might be considered, alternately, a very good specimen of each, in purely extemporaneous productions. To the rules of rhetoric, or the arts of studied eloquence, he paid little regard; but if the true eloquence of the pulpit be, as Blair defines it, 'to make an impression on the people—to strike and seize their hearts,' he was a master, and, in comparison of thousands who claim to be such, more than a master. No man ever succeeded more uniformly to move his congregation to tears, and, sometimes, even to trembling and loud cries, than Bishop George did.

In his mode of preaching he preserved the happy medium between a course of cold, metaphysical reasoning, on the one hand, and an ostentatious, theatrical frivolity, on the other. He usually chose practical and experimental subjects as the topics of his discourses, and united, in the discussion of them, gravity and warmth, the great essentials of pulpit eloquence. He was a man

of a wide range of thought, and a fertile imagination; and he manifested great judgment in the management of his sermons, so as not only to attract the attention of his hearers at the very commencement, but to command it throughout, and to keep their feelings alive to every sentiment and idea he had a desire to impress upon their minds. Although he made no great pretensions to literary attainments, yet he was well instructed in the holy Scriptures, and in all practical subjects connected with his profession; and his sermons were justly esteemed by good judges to be of a superior order, as well for the good sense and cogent reasoning they displayed, as for their animating fervour.

But, after all, what contributed chiefly to distinguish Bishop George as a great and successful preacher, for such he was universally esteemed to be, was the deep piety of his heart. Without this all his other qualifications would have been but as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. He was mighty in the Scriptures mostly, because his own heart was deeply affected with an abiding sense of their truth and importance. The great objects of preaching were, in his view, to convince and persuade sinners, and console and strengthen believers; and to the accomplishment of these objects he directed all his potent energies. It was evident to all who heard him, that he was devoutly sincere, and that the feelings of his heart for the salvation of his hearers were more than he could express. The hidden man of the heart appeared to be struggling within, to give vent to feelings and emotions which language failed to describe. Hence his hearers, whether pious or profane, were struck with a sense of reverence and respect for the man, the very moment he commenced addressing them; and as they could detect no signs of self complacency, or the workings of pride within, he was permitted to retain his hold upon the sentiments of regard they entertained for him, as being influenced by motives of good will toward them. With this advantage he addressed his appeals to the strongest feelings of their hearts, and seldom or never failed to produce the desired effect. As Felix trembled when Paul preached to him, so many proud-hearted sinners have been seen to gaze, and weep, and tremble, while the venerable Bishop George has been proclaiming the terrors of the Lord, or the love of Christ to a perishing world. Preaching of this kind, flowing from a heart deeply imbued with a spirit of piety, could not but be affecting. True it is, that the preaching of our Lord himself was rejected by some, and some too upon whom it had at first a powerful influence. God never designed that the most efficacious means should save men in any other way than as moral agents. But in the ordinary course of causes and events, the preaching of Bishop George was calculated to be productive of awakenings and conversions to a great extent. And so it was. Thousands will bless God, in time and eternity, for sending so able and successful a labourer into his vineyard.

Bishop George was, in the true sense of the word, a popular preacher, and might have been blazoned as such beyond most men in our country; but he would not. Every thing which had a factitious tendency to call the attention of the public towards him in any other light than as a plain minister of Jesus Christ, labouring solely for the honor of his Master, he studiously avoided. He appeared to wish not to be known while he lived, or remembered after his death, any farther than as he might be an humble instrument in promoting the honor of Christ, and the advancement of his kingdom.

The following remarks have been furnished by Bishop Hedding, one of the respected colleagues of Bishop George, and, more generally than any other, his travelling companion during the last four years of his life. They are the result of an intimate knowledge of his spirit and deportment, in all the various scenes through which he was called to pass.

‘On his journeys from one conference to another, [says Bishop Hedding,] he usually preached as often as his health and other labours would admit, often travelling a distance out of his way to attend campmeetings, quarterly meetings, and other important religious exercises.

He deeply felt the importance of the great work in which he was engaged, and his high responsibility in the difficult business he was called to manage, especially that of stationing the preachers. Hence, on his way to the conferences, he took great pains to make such inquiries of the preachers and of the people, respecting the wants of the societies, the gifts, grace, and usefulness of the preachers, &c, as would prepare him to make such an arrangement of the appointments, as would best subserve the interests of the church, and the progress of the gospel. And while the prosperity of his Master’s work was his great object in fixing the appointments, he was not unmindful of the feelings and interests of the preachers. He felt a deep concern for their health, their comfort, and for those of their families, and was careful to provide for them, as far as was consistent with the great end of their calling. Many seasons of anxiety have I known him pass on this subject, both before and at the time of making the appointments; always looking in prayer to the great Head of the church for direction. And if at any time, after the appointments were read, and the preachers were dispersed, he found he had made an erroneous appointment, it occasioned him great sorrow of heart.

His love for the Lord’s flock led him to be watchful for difficulties and dangers among them, that he might be early prepared to exert his influence to prevent or to remove the evils to which he well knew the infirmities of human nature rendered them liable. And I have often been agreeably surprised in perceiving the depth of his skill, the wisdom of his counsel, and the strength of his influence, in settling difficulties, both among the preachers and members, which had threatened great injury to the cause of God.

Bishop George was believed to be, both by the preachers and people, what he really was, *a man of God*; and, therefore, they looked up to him with great deference, and listened to his advice with great attention. Consequently, he was enabled to accomplish what few other men could do, in promoting a spirit of brotherly friendship among the ministers and members of the church of Christ. And although he was strict in his ideas of a moral and religious life, and firm in his demands for an offending brother to come back to the rules of the gospel, yet when he saw one who had erred, willing to repent and return, no one was more ready than he to overlook all that was past, and to restore such a one in the spirit of meekness.

He was a man of great patience and fortitude, to endure the inconveniencies, and meet the dangers of a travelling life. I have often seen him put to the trial of both these virtues; in journeying by sea and by land, by day and by night, on the mountains and in the wilderness and swamps. Sometimes unavoidably falling in with bad company, meeting with uncomfortable accommodations, hungry, and thirsty, and weary; but he always carried with him that spirit of the gospel, which enabled him to possess his soul in patience, and cheerfully to follow a suffering Master.

From his constitutional disposition to quickness of thought, and feeling, and action, I had supposed that a time of danger would alarm and disconcert him. But I have twice seen him in apparent danger of suddenly losing his life, once travelling in the wilderness, and once on the raging waters; when I supposed, and I thought he did also, that death was near; but he appeared to possess all that calmness and recollection which were indicative of a firm belief that his heavenly Father held the care both of his soul and of his body, in every situation in which he could be placed.

Bishop George was a man of devotion, both in private and in public. In the sloop, the steamboat, the canal boat, the barn, the woods, as well as in the closet, he sought opportunity to pour out his soul to God in secret prayer.

He lived not for himself only, but for Christ and his cause. When that cause prospered he rejoiced and gave thanks, and when it was wounded he mourned and wept.

He stood high in the affections and confidence of the great body of the preachers and people with whom I am acquainted; and when he died, many thousands lamented.

Bishop George, we will only add, was uniformly plain in his manners and dress. In him were united an assemblage of all those external qualities which gave him the appearance of an apostolical bishop. He occupied a conspicuous place in the ranks of Methodism during a period of its history peculiarly calculated to test the attachment of its friends. He lived to see its institutions flourish, its influence extend in all directions, and hundreds of thousands converted to the Lord, through its instrumentality. In

him the Christian graces were ripened into maturity, and he left the world in the triumphs of faith. His virtues will live in the recollection of all who knew him; and we feel a conscious satisfaction, that in transmitting to posterity this imperfect sketch of his life, we perform a service to the church, and pay a merited tribute to departed worth.

A FARTHER REVIEW OF THE CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR'S STRICTURES
ON DOCTOR ADAM CLARKE'S DISCOURSES.

IN a review of the Christian Spectator's strictures on Dr. Adam Clarke's Discourses, in our April number, we mentioned that, in that article, we had purposely confined ourselves chiefly to the subject of education and learning, with a view of leaving the gentlemen's metaphysics for a distinct notice, in a future number. We now resume the subject, in order to redeem that pledge. But before we proceed to the main points, it will be proper to notice some miscellaneous observations of the Christian Spectator, which cannot well be classed under any distinct head, being obviously digressions from the gentlemen's direct path, for the purpose, as it would seem, of preventing any mistake as to the peculiar character of their kind feelings toward Dr. Clarke. 'His Commentary on the Scriptures,' say the gentlemen, 'opens with some ten or twenty reasons to prove that the serpent who tempted Eve was a baboon.' To prove that a serpent was a baboon, would indeed be a difficult task. This is a solecism, however, of the gentlemen's own. Dr. Clarke does indeed advance reasons to show that the original term, in the place in question, most probably does not signify a serpent, but 'a creature of the *ape* or *ouran outang* kind.' And what has the Christian Spectator, or any one else, said to refute those reasons? Jeers and sneers in abundance have been resorted to; but what learning or logic is there in these? and would they be likely to be so plentifully used, if any thing better were convenient? We are not ourselves partial to a departure from the common version of this passage, believing as we do that the question as to the shape assumed by the tempter, in man's original seduction and apostasy, is one of insignificant moment, compared with the fundamental truth of the fall itself, in regard to which our sturdiest opponents will hardly venture to charge Dr. Clarke or us with heretical pravity. And, indeed, as to the effects of the fall, on the whole offspring of corrupt fallen man, we greatly misconceive the Christian Spectator, and some other kindred writers of that class, if it will not appear before we close this article, that Calvin himself, according to them, was greatly heterodox, and *Pelagius* a guide far more to their taste.

We have seen, on a former occasion, that the gentlemen characterize Methodists as a sect 'distinguished for fervid declamation

against human learning,' and at the same time, as the admirers of a commentator whose work they themselves are desirous to decry as *too learned*. They find it more convenient, however, to attack it by sarcasm than by superior learning, and attempt to disparage it by a contrast, in this respect, with the commentary of Dr. Scott. 'Had Dr. Scott [say they] crowded his works, in this way, with learned and abstruse matter, what would have been the result? Could they ever have become generally popular, till the abstruse and the illegible matter was swept from his pages? Would his Bible, especially, ever have become a "*family Bible*?"'—p. 554. Great efforts, we know, have been made, and are still made, to get Dr. Scott's work introduced as a 'family Bible.' But we apprehend a main reason is that his glosses are calculated to imbue the susceptible minds of youth and servants in families, with the Calvinian peculiarities of his creed, more effectually than the simple unadulterated Scriptures, and that this is its true recommendation, much more than its great inferiority to Dr. Clarke's Commentary in point of learning. For our part we shall regret the day when Dr. Scott's Commentary, or Dr. Clarke's, or any other, shall be made 'a family Bible,' and thus the words of God, in family devotion, be swallowed up in the words of men. Much has been said, and most falsely said, about our substituting 'Wesley's Testament' for the common version. Yet, much as we value that translation, as the version of an able master of language, and for comparison with other versions, we should promptly and decidedly discourage any attempt to introduce it into family devotion, (or into the pulpit,) instead of the common version. So also should we the substitution of Dr. Clarke's or any other commentary. It may be said, indeed, that the *text* is read as well as the commentary. But we apprehend it is little of the former, and much of the latter;—a small portion of God's word, and a large portion of man's; and that, too, with the former so cut up and disjointed, and its separated fragments so wrapped up in the latter, that the ordinary listener loses the spirit in the letter, the substance in the shade. Commentaries, in their proper place, are highly valuable, and we are far from wishing to depreciate them. But whenever they shall be exalted to the rank of 'family Bibles,' they will become a curse instead of a blessing. As a specimen of the difference between the word of God and the word of Dr. Scott, when the Calvinian peculiarities of the latter are pressed by the former, we give the following. St. Paul says, 'Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died,' Rom. xiv, 15. This Dr. Scott explains as a caution against doing that which had a *tendency* to the ruin of one for whom Christ died; not that it implies that the weak brother would actually perish. In this, Mr. Watson remarks, 'as it is assumed that it was a doctrine taught by St. Paul, and received by the churches to whom he wrote, that the elect could not perish, the motive is taken away upon which the admonition is grounded.

For if the persons to whom the Apostle wrote, knew that the weak brother, for whom Christ died, could not perish, then nothing which they could do had any "*tendency*" to destroy him. "It might injure him, disturb his mind, lead him into sin, destroy his comforts; all, or any of which, would have been appropriate motives on which to have urged the caution: but nothing can have even a tendency to *destroy* him whose salvation is fixed by an unalterable decree. Mr. Scott is, however, evidently, not satisfied with his own interpretation; and gives a painful example of the influence of a preconceived system in commenting upon Scripture, by charging the apostle himself with careless writing. "We may, however, observe [says Dr. Scott,] that the apostles did not write in that exact systematical style, which some affect, otherwise they would *scrupulously have avoided such expressions.*" This is rather in the manner of Priestley and Belsham, than that of an orthodox commentator; but it does homage to the force of truth by turning away from it, and by tacitly acknowledging that the Scriptures cannot be Calvinistically interpreted.'—*Theological Institutes*, vol. iii, p. 13. The same commentator (Dr. Scott,) charges St. Peter with a similar want of exactness in writing, that is with not being systematically Calvinistic like his expositor. St. Peter speaks of some 'denying the Lord that bought them, and bringing upon themselves swift destruction,' 2 Pet. ii, 1. On this passage Dr. Scott says,—'It is not requisite to understand the Apostle as declaring that the Lord Jesus had died with an express *intention* of redeeming these very persons,'—and then apologizes for St. Peter's looseness of phraseology by saying, almost in the same words as he had before used toward St. Paul, 'it was not the manner of the sacred writers to express themselves with that systematic exactness which many now affect.' It would require much more than its scarcity of 'learned matter' to induce us to adopt as a 'family Bible,' a work which thus labours to warp God's word to serve a system, instead of reforming that system by the word.*

The Christian Spectator makes an insidious attempt to represent Dr. Clarke as an admirer of Thomas Aquinas. Dr. Clarke does select from 'this eminent schoolman and divine,' as he denominates him, several of the *a priori* arguments in support of the being of God, which he considers very simple, level to most capacities, and powerfully convincing. But might he not do this without subjecting himself to the imputation of being an unqualified admirer of Thomas Aquinas? Will the Christian Spectator say that Thomas Aquinas was not, in fact, ranked among the most eminent schoolmen and divines of his day? or will the gentlemen, in consequence of our using this phraseology, charge us too with

* In a late number of the American Quarterly Review, a work which certainly evinces no partiality for Methodism, the following high and merited tribute is paid to Dr. Clarke, as a biblical critic, and as a linguist.

'In acquaintance with biblical criticism, Dr. Adam Clarke is surpassed by few, while, as a linguist, he stands almost alone.'

being admirers of Thomas Aquinas, in the unrestricted sense which their disingenuous language goes to impute to Dr. Clarke? We should not hesitate, for our part, to style John Calvin, President Edwards, and possibly, did we know them all, some even of the distinguished gentlemen concerned in the *Christian Spectator*, 'eminent divines.' But we should most strenuously protest against being, therefore, considered their unqualified admirers.

Dr. Mosheim, himself a Lutheran, and his translator, Dr. Mac-laine, a Calvinist, will hardly be suspected of partiality to the papal schoolmen. Yet the former calls Thomas Aquinas 'the great luminary of the scholastic world;' and in enumerating the writers of that century, (the xiiith,) says, 'The writers of this century, who obtained the greatest renown on account of their laborious researches in what was called philosophical or dialectical theology, were Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, and Bonaventura, who were each of them truly possessed of an inquisitive turn of mind, a sublime and penetrating genius, accompanied with an uncommon talent of sounding the most hidden truths, and treating with facility the most abstruse subjects, though they are all chargeable with errors and reveries that do little honor to their memories. The other writers, who trod the same intricate paths of metaphysical divinity, were many in number, and several of them justly admired, though much inferior in renown to the celebrated triumvirate now mentioned; such were Alexander de Hales, the interpreter of Aristotle, William of Paris, Robert Capito, Thomas Cantipratensis, John de Peckham, William Durand, Roger Bacon, Richard Middleton, Ægidius de Columna, Armand de Bello Visu, and several others.'—*Eccles. Hist. Cent. xiii, Part ii, Ch. ii.*

On this passage Dr. Mac-laine remarks, in a note, 'We are surprised to find Roger Bacon thrust here into a crowd of vulgar *literati*, since that great man, whose astonishing genius and universal learning have already been taken notice of, was in every respect superior to Albert and Bonaventura, two of the heroes of Dr. Mosheim's triumvirate.'—*Ib.*

Here it is worthy of observation, that Dr. Mac-laine himself does not object to even Roger Bacon's being placed behind Thomas Aquinas, in a picture in which the latter occupies so conspicuous a position. Mosheim calls Albertus Magnus 'a man of vast abilities, and a universal dictator at this time,' yet Dr. Mac-laine considered him in every respect inferior to Roger Bacon; though while asserting this, he nevertheless makes no objection to Bacon's being ranked in the list below Aquinas, the second member of Mosheim's triumvirate. We are not less 'surprised' at this, than Dr. Mac-laine was to find Bacon postponed by Mosheim to Albert and Bonaventure. It is far from our intention to volunteer our services as the champions of Aquinas; or to attempt to settle the questions of precedence between the 'Irrefragable,' the 'Angelic,' and the 'Admirable' doctors, as Albert, Aquinas,

and Bacon, were severally styled in their day. Our intention is simply to show the ground of Dr. Clarke's passing adoption of a frequent phraseology, in reference to one of those men. And in truth, as to his theological system, we suspect some of our Calvinistic friends would be found, on an investigation, much more likely to be 'admirers' of Thomas Aquinas, than Dr. Clarke; for it was Aquinas, of all the schoolmen, who, at the head of the Dominicans, adopted the strongest views of Augustine on predestination and necessity, whilst his great adversary Scotus, and the Franciscans, took the opposite side. In like manner, it was Augustinism that was perfected and systematized by the hand of Calvin; and in this regard, he and Aquinas, as well as Augustine, are equally styled 'eminent divines.' We are not of opinion, however, that Aquinas did in truth possess either talents or learning equal to his fame. Yet the system which he adopted afforded a most favorable field for the imposing display of his loquacious metaphysics, and for the subtilties of his Aristotelian dialectics. It was in this way that he endeavoured to establish his hard doctrine, (as Bishop Horsely denominates it,) of arbitrary predestination,— 'a doctrine to which, [as the same eminent writer adds,] whether we consider it in itself, or in its consequences, we may with good reason apply the words of the prophet, "It hath truly little form or comeliness,—little beauty, that we should desire it."

In reading the *Christian Spectator* and other kindred publications, it is truly wonderful to observe, whenever Methodism is in question, in regard to either its polity or its doctrines, what amazing ignorance is exhibited by gentlemen whom, in other general respects, we cannot but presume to be enlightened and well informed. Indeed this singular phenomenon is not confined to *writers* of this class. It extends to preachers and public speakers also; and in its occasional exhibitions, even in the sacred desk, borders on the extreme of the ludicrous mingled with the marvellous. We ourselves have witnessed an instance of this sort, in effect, in regard to Arminianism, in an 'eminent divine' of the Congregational order, before a large congregation, in a Presbyterian church, in the city of New-York. His subject was, the servant who knew his Lord's will and did it not. In discussing this subject, his leading proposition was, that man *of himself, without the aid of divine grace*, is fully capable of doing God's will; and that the idea of our dependence on divine grace, or the aid of the Holy Spirit, for this ability, is a great, if not a fatal, error. These positions were enforced with great earnestness and at much length; and although, possibly, we may not quote the words of the preacher exactly, as we quote from memory, and after some months' lapse of time, yet we think we cannot have been mistaken as to the substance of the doctrine. It made a deep impression on us at the time, and struck us with amazement that it should be listened to with apparent favor by a *Presbyterian* congregation, in the city of New-York.

But how was the measure of our astonishment filled when the gentleman, after having wound himself up to the top of his eloquence and zeal, in support of this very quintessence of the Pelagian heresy, exclaimed,—‘But this is not *Arminianism*!—*Arminianism* is—not only that man is, of himself, without the aid of divine grace, fully *capable* of doing God’s will,—but that of himself, and without the aid of divine grace, he actually *does* it!’—Is it possible, thought we, as we mused on this prodigious exclamation, that this ‘eminent divine’ (for such, in the estimation of our Congregational brethren, he truly is,) does not *know* better? Or can it be possible that, knowing better, he would make such an assertion? We are aware that some gentlemen of this class, when charged with the gross injustice and groundlessness of such statements, resort to the pitiful subterfuge that they do not mean Methodism:—far, very far from it!—They love the Methodists, and consider them a most useful, and indeed an *evangelical* denomination. They mean Arians and Socinians! Why then do they not say so publicly? Why, without qualification or explanation, do they use a term which they cannot but know, when thus used, is ordinarily understood by their hearers and readers to embrace not only the Methodists, but the great body of the Protestant Episcopalians, and of the established Church of England, (if not of Scotland,) as well as a large portion of other denominations, who, as well as we, stand opposed to Unitarianism in all its forms and ramifications, certainly not less than our self styled most ‘evangelical’ opponents. Is not such a course, to say the least, most disingenuous? Is it not equally so, as if we should assert that Calvinism embraces the monstrous doctrine of transubstantiation;—and when called to an account for such perversion of language, should attempt to defend ourselves by saying, that we mean the Calvinism of Jansenius, and not of John Calvin? ‘It is the wilful deceit [says Dr. Paley,] that makes the lie; and we wilfully deceive, when our expressions are not true in the sense in which we believe the hearer to apprehend them.’ Now can we reasonably suppose, that the class of gentlemen in question are ignorant that under the general title of Arminians, as contradistinguished from Calvinists, Methodists, in the acceptance of the public generally, are included? Have such gentlemen not, at least, looked into Buck’s *Theological Dictionary*—the very popular work of a Calvinistic author? ‘It is generally supposed, [says Buck,] that a majority of the clergy in both the established churches of Great Britain, favor the Arminian system.—The name of Mr. John Wesley hardly need be mentioned here. *Every one knows* what an advocate he was for the tenets of Arminius, and the success he met with. See *METHODISTS*.’—*Theological Dictionary*, title ARMINIANS.

Under the same title, this Calvinistic author, so much more candid and fair than our modern opponents, says, the third distinguishing tenet of the Arminians is,

‘That true faith cannot proceed from the exercise of our natural faculties and powers, nor from the force and operation of free will ; since man, in consequence of his natural corruption, is incapable either of thinking or doing any good thing ; and that, therefore, it is necessary, in order to his conversion and salvation, that he be regenerated and renewed by the operations of the Holy Ghost, which is the gift of God through Jesus Christ.’

The fourth, he says, is,

‘That this divine grace, or energy of the Holy Ghost, begins and perfects every thing that can be called good in man, and, consequently all good works are to be attributed to God alone ; that, nevertheless, this grace is offered to all, and does not force men to act against their inclinations, but may be resisted and rendered ineffectual by the perverse will of the impenitent sinner.’

It is true he adds, that ‘some modern Arminians interpret this and the last article with a greater latitude.’ But these are exceptions, of such as differ from the body of true Arminians. So Buck evidently understood and intended it. So he represents it ; and so would every other well informed and candid man. Such Arminians, in truth, are, ‘after all,’ no Arminians.

As Mr. John Wesley was considered the arch Arminian of his day, and called his magazine ‘The Arminian Magazine,’ a farther extract from Buck will show with what justice Arminianism, properly understood, is liable to the abominable charge of the eminent Congregational divine above alluded to. We dwell on this case the longer because the gentleman to whose statements we refer, is, we believe, one of the most distinguished patrons of the Christian Spectator, and is ranked among the first of those by whom that work is recommended. That this gentleman, in the representations which he thinks proper to give of Arminianism, in his public preaching, means Arminianism as held by Arminius, we think the more probable, because, in one of his printed sermons, he classes Arminius himself, in connexion with idolaters, Mohammedans, Papists, Arians, and the enemies of evangelical sentiment at Geneva, as among those ‘resources of the adversary’ [the devil], under which the whole creation has groaned and travailed in pain until now.

The following, then, on the point in question, is a brief view of the sentiments of John Wesley.

‘The author of faith and salvation is God alone. There is no more of power than of merit in man ; but as all merit is in the Son of God, in what he has done and suffered for us, so all power is in the Spirit of God. And, therefore, every man, in order to believe unto salvation, must receive the Holy Ghost. So far Mr. Wesley.’—*Buck, Art. ‘Methodists, Protestant.’* We choose to quote Buck here, in preference to quoting directly from Mr. Wesley’s own works, with a hope that the representations of a Calvinistic writer may receive attention from some of our opponents, and that

it may be seen how extremely easy of access to them more correct information has been. The original passage may be found in Mr. Wesley's 'Appeal to men of reason and religion.' The same doctrine, in substance, was taught by Arminius.*

The conductors of the *Christian Spectator*, indeed, have evidently, in several important respects, abandoned the long cherished dogmas of the old Calvinistic creed, and, in some, appear at least to have come over to a nearer agreement with us. On the whole, however, we cannot but think that they have greatly marred the form of Calvinism itself, and that the novelties which they have grafted on its original stock, have rendered it a crab of still bitterer and more pernicious fruit. The truths which they seem to have really adopted, in common with us, in contradistinction from old Calvinism, serve, indeed, more extensively to recommend their system to public favor; whilst, in reality, the most revolting parts of the old creed are still retained, but decorated and covered, *ad captandum*, with a most deceivable show of fair words, and strangely compounded with what, in our apprehension, are verily among the grossest, most dangerous, and antichristian parts of the Pelagian and Unitarian heresies. We speak plainly and strongly, and wish to be understood precisely as we speak; because, in our judgment, the scheme of the *Christian Spectator*, on the points to which we allude, is one of the most dangerous ever introduced into this Christian community, and calculated fundamentally to overthrow the whole Christian system. This we incline to think is not *our* opinion only, but that of a learned, pious, and most respectable portion of the Presbyterian church itself, as we shall hereafter take occasion to show. But first, and with much more pleasure, we shall quote an excellent passage from the *Christian Spectator*, in which we most cordially agree, as fixing the standard by which all theological controversies must ultimately be decided, and by which, and which alone, we consent and claim to be judged in this discussion.

* When considering themselves, and those with whom they act, as assailed, from another quarter, the gentlemen of the *Christian Spectator*, 'have no idea that duty requires [them] to speak mincingly.' Hence they do not hesitate to denominate certain language of an 'honorable senator,' on the floor of the senate of the United States, 'a paragraph of vulgar calumny.'—'Who [they exclaim, naming him,] is the honorable ———?'—'Whatever he may be,—he has lifted up his voice—to traduce, and by falsehood to defame,' &c.—'We say by falsehood, direct, inexcusable falsehood; for even if it should be pleaded that he *believed* the stale calumnies which he was repeating, such a plea in such a case, has no validity, whatever may be its truth. The case is such, that if he knew no better, he ought to have known, and his ignorance or error is no excuse.——Can the plea of ignorance or error afford one shadow of excuse to any intelligent and highminded man, who will lend his name and authority to secure currency for calumnies like these;—calumnies at once so vile, and so palpably untrue?'—This is, indeed, language 'strong and direct.' Whether it be or be not 'too strong,' for the case intended, it is not necessary for us here to express any opinion. But certain we are of this:—if it be not too strong in that case, then neither would it be if adopted by us, in reference to the public definition of 'Arminianism' above alluded to;—nor, indeed, in reference to the tenor of the articles in general in the *Christian Spectator*, and other kindred publications, whenever, almost, they are pleased to speak on the subject of 'Methodism.' We choose, however, to forbear.

We shall next notice some points of agreement in which the Christian Spectator seems to have come over to us, and others on which they profess to agree with Dr. Clarke, though seemingly surprised to find such doctrine in a Methodist commentator, and 'on the whole inclined to think he intends to put his brethren right,'—though his brethren have always held, and preached, and published, just the same thing. We shall afterward notice some metaphysical speculations on which the Christian Spectator, we think, greatly misrepresents Dr. Clarke, and does him gross injustice. We shall then adduce a few of the principal but capital objections to the scheme of the Christian Spectator, and conclude with a juster view of Dr. Clarke's note on Acts, and of his Discourses.

The passage which we quote with pleasure from the Christian Spectator, is the following.

'But while we should preach, and hear, and study with patience and delight, the *revealed* attributes of God and of man, let us beware of that excessive passion for theory, which leads its devotee to supply from imagination the real or supposed chasms which God has left in his word. Let the inquisitive lover of truth penetrate to the depths, or soar to the sublime heights where revelation would lead him, but there let him stop. At a period like this, when a taste for investigation appears to be awakening with new vigor, there is peculiar need both of the encouragement and the caution, contained in that memorable declaration of the aged Moses to the generation of Israel, who had grown up under his instruction: "*The secret things belong unto the Lord our God; but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law.*" On this passage Dr. Scott has the following remark: "Almost all the heresies and controversies, which have corrupted the purity, or disturbed the peace of the church in every age, have originated from disregard to this distinction; from vain attempts, by human reasonings and authority, to fill up supposed chasms in revelation, and to make it more apparently consistent and systematical than it hath pleased God to make it; from deducing disputable consequences from revelation, or tracing back its sacred mysteries to some *unrevealed* antecedent causes." Admirable reflection, on a most admirable theme! Would to God, that both text and comment were inscribed on brass, and placed in the study and right before the eye of every one, who is to preach, or write, or speak, or think on the great doctrines of godliness. With this in view, let each one of us, young and old, review most prayerfully his present creed, and compare it with the word of God; ready to remove, with a cautious but unsparing hand, all those portions which shall appear manifestly of mere human fabrication. And having done this, let us proceed with the like circumspect regard to revelation, to enlarge and fill up the measure of our faith, that we may no longer be incumbered, or be the means of incumbering others, with that which at best is but "wood, hay, and stubble." Absolutely here, if any where in the whole range of intellect, man needs to know and to keep steadily in view, the proper boundaries to the province of human reason; yet no where have they

been so frequently or so violently trampled down. Is there not some one of all the gifted sons of the church, to rise up in the hour of need, and mark more clearly to our vision these sacred confines? An effective work "on the province of human reason," would be as great an encouragement to thorough investigation, as it would a barrier to vain and hurtful speculation. And designedly such is the rapid and comet-like outline, given in the brief declaration from the lips of Moses, on "secret and revealed things." It is designed at once as a *stimulus* and *guide* to the candid inquirer, and a *frowning barrier* to the audacious theorist.—pp. 558-9.

Had Dr. Scott himself observed 'that memorable declaration of the aged Moses,' he might have spared his reflections on the apostles' want of systematical exactness in their expressions, and his pains to make their doctrine more systematically consistent [with his own favorite Calvinistic creed] than it pleased God to make it. That this creed 'had its source [says Mr. Watson,] in a course of induction from the sacred Scriptures, though erroneous, is not probable; for, if it had been left to that test, it is pretty certain it would not have maintained itself. It appears rather to have arisen from metaphysical hypotheses and school subtleties, to which the sense of Scripture has been accommodated, often very violently; and by subtleties of this kind, it has, at all times, been chiefly supported.'—*Theological Institutes*, vol. iii, p. 152. We may add, too, that had the conductors of the *Christian Spectator* 'been suitably mindful of the revealed caution on this subject, we surely should never have had such speculations from [their] pen as some of those which it' will hereafter become 'our duty to notice.'

The *Christian Spectator* seems (as we desire to adopt the most charitable construction,) entirely to have misapprehended the ground of Dr. Clarke's distinction between *mercy* and *goodness*, as attributes of the Deity,—the latter being regarded by him as an attribute essentially and eternally existing, before all worlds;—the former, as now an attribute indeed, yet in a qualified sense, being in truth but a mode of the '*manifestation*' of goodness, in consequence of the entrance of sin. 'If God could not be merciful [say the gentlemen,] or long suffering till there was a sinful object towards which to exercise these attributes, how could he even have been good, till there was some other being than himself to be the object of his goodness.'—p. 559. We answer;—God's essential goodness, in the sense obviously intended by Dr. Clarke, in the passage in question, strictly relates to *Himself*, irrespectively of, and antecedently to, all creation. It has not reference either to His *mercy* or His *love*,—but simply to His own inherent absolute excellence, and perfection of holiness, from everlasting to everlasting.

The points on which the *Christian Spectator* seems to have come over to us, and others on which it professes to agree with Dr. Clarke, though surprised to find him holding such sentiments, are

1. On the subject of *free will*.

'We turn with great pleasure [says the Christian Spectator,] to some remarks of Dr. Clarke in the sermon before us, on *free will*.'

The gentlemen then quote the following passage from Dr. Clarke's discourse on 'Genuine happiness.'

'The question about *free will* has long agitated *divines* and *philosophers*; with their contentions I have nothing to do: but the *subject* of their controversies, as far as the *term* which they use is concerned, is absurd. *Will* necessarily implies *mental freedom*, or a *power in the soul to choose or refuse*: the addition of the word *free* to it is absurd and ridiculous, because *freedom* is essential to the *being* of *WILL*; *bound will* or *will overruled by necessity*, is equally absurd; because *binding* and *necessitating* imply in themselves, when connected with *will*, or the *power to choose and refuse*, essentially opposite ideas; *WILL bound or necessitated*, is *WILL annihilated*. When *free volition*, in reference to *choice and refusal* ends; then, the thing itself *ceases to exist*, and *another principle* takes its place. The *forcing of the will*, implies such an essential contradiction and impossibility, that it is one of those things which cannot be done by Omnipotence itself; because it implies *absurdity* and *contradiction*. God may annihilate the will; but he cannot *force* it; for this would be to undo, by an absolute contradiction, the work of his own hands.

God gave man this faculty, that he might be a *free*, rewardable, or punishable *moral agent*; and by his own eternal power and energy, he supports this faculty, rendering it *superior to all force or constraint*, that he may continue man a rational creature; preserve his accountability, and render him capable of salvation. On this supposition, and on this alone, is the whole *Revelation of God* addressed to man, in all its promises, threatenings, exhortations, entreaties, expostulations, and warnings. p. 193.'

On these sentiments of Dr. Clarke, the gentlemen say,

'This is perfectly correct. We have before thought it one of the most absurd things in the world, to speak of the will as any other-wise than free; but we do not recollect to have met with such a statement in any other author. The whole subject is indeed begun and ended for ever, for aught we can see, by simply putting the unanswerable question, what can that volition be which is not *voluntary*? —which is not *free*? It savours not at all of rashness to say, that neither God nor any other being can touch the freedom of the will, without destroying all power to will. And this is saying no more than that God cannot cause a thing to be and not to be, at the same time. *Will* in its very nature must be *free*, or not *exist* at all.' p. 571.

We are very happy to perceive that, on this important point, the gentlemen so entirely abandon old Calvinism, and so heartily and fully agree with us. It now appears, indeed, as plain to them as it has always done to us, and the contrary as 'one of the most absurd things in the world.' And our only wonder is that it does not appear so, and has not always done so, to all good and thinking men. This, however, is one of those famous 'five points,' for

the maintaining of which, Arminianism, and particularly that 'Arminian priest' John Wesley, were formerly subjected to so much scurrilous obloquy, of which the following is a specimen,

'When Mr. Fletcher, [says Mr. Southey,] offended his antagonists, it was not by any personalities, or the slightest breathing of a malicious spirit, but by the ironical manner in which he displayed the real nature of their monstrous doctrine. For his talents were of the quick mercurial kind; his fancy was always active, and he might have held no inconsiderable rank, both as a humorous and as an impassioned writer, if he had not confined himself wholly to devotional subjects. But his happy illustrations had the effect of provoking his opponents. Mr. Wesley, also, by the unanswerable manner in which he treated the Calvinistic question, drew upon himself the fierce resentment of a host of enemies. They were confounded, but they would not be convinced; and they assailed him with a degree of rancorous hatred, which, even in theological controversy, has never been exceeded. "He was as weak as he was vicious," they said: "he was like a monkey, an eel, or a squirrel, perpetually twisting and twining all manner of ways.* There was little probity, or common honesty discoverable in that man—that Arminian priest:—he was incapable of appreciating real merit; and his blasphemous productions were horror to the soul, and torture to the ear. And for his doctrine,—the cursed doctrine of free-will,—it was the most God-dishonouring and soul-distressing doctrine of the day; it was one of the prominent features of the Beast; it was the enemy of God, and the offspring of the wicked one; the insolent brat of hell. Arminianism was the spiritual pestilence, which had given the Protestant churches the plague: like a mortal scorpion, it carries a sting in its tail, that affects with stupefaction, insensibility, and death, all whom it strikes." '—*Life of Wesley*, vol. ii, pp. 382–3.

The reader will observe here, that, pestilential as Arminianism was in the estimation of its rude opponents in those days, that 'insolent brat of hell,' *free will*, they held to be 'the most God-dishonouring and soul-distressing' part of the whole scheme: yet it is this very 'insolent brat' which the Christian Spectator now fully and explicitly adopts, and agrees that the denial of it is one of the most absurd things in the world.

2. The next item, on which the gentlemen profess agreement with Dr. Clarke, (and on which Dr. Clarke neither thinks 'his

* In reference to abuse of this sort, Mr. W., in a letter to the Rev. Dr. Rutherford, one of his opponents, says,—'You frequently charge me with *evasion*: and others have brought the same charge. The plain case is this: I have wrote on various heads, and always as plainly as I could. Yet many have misunderstood my words, and raised abundance of objections. I answered them, by explaining myself, showing what I did not mean, and what I did. One and another of the objectors stretched his throat, and cried out, "*Evasion! Evasion!*" And what does all this outcry amount to? Why exactly thus much. They imagined they had tied me so fast that it was impossible for me to escape. But presently the cobwebs were swept away, and I was quite at liberty. And I bless God I can unravel truth and falsehood, although artfully twisted together. Of *such evasion* I am not ashamed. Let them be ashamed who constrain me to use it.'

brethren' wrong, nor, so far as we know, do they think him wrong,) is 'the *saint's perseverance*.'

'We pass [say the gentlemen,] to another topic—the *saint's perseverance*. On this Dr. Clarke says but little; but we rejoice to see that this little is mostly if not entirely correct, whether he expressly designed to teach the doctrine or not.

He freely uses such expressions as this: "there is no infallible *necessity* of continuance," in a state of grace. And so say we with equal emphasis. The only question is, *will* God complete the work of grace in every heart where he begins it? No where, that we know of, does Dr. Clarke deny this; but in several passages his language encourages us to presume that he believes it to be true.' p. 580.

Dr. Clarke and his brethren believe that God '*will* complete the work of grace in every heart where he begins it'—*provided* that heart continues to cleave to Christ, by a living, fruitful faith: but not otherwise.

'Did we not know the author [continues the Christian Spectator,] to be a staunch Methodist, we should consider the following passages as expressly designed to prove the doctrine, in the exact sense in which we hold it; and we are on the whole inclined to think he intends to put his brethren right on this point. We do not say his arguments are all sound in their full extent. We will first quote from a sermon on Philippians i, 9–11.

"And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and in all judgment; that ye may approve things that are excellent, that ye may be sincere and without offence till the day of Christ: being filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ, to the glory and praise of God." p. 100.

After speaking of the benefit of intercessory prayer in general, he says:

"But there is an essential difference between the *prayers of inspired men* and those of *private Christians*, how good or holy soever they may be; as the former pray for the church and the world, *according to direct inspiration*, God having determined to grant the blessings for which he excites them to pray. Hence, all such *prayers* may be viewed as direct *promises*, and claimed as such by those in whose behalf they are offered. On this principle, the prayer in the above verses must have been considered by the Philippians, as containing a series of promises, the fulfilment of which they had a right to expect, if faithful to the grace by which they were thus favored. "And this I pray, that ye may," etc. But can *we* who live at such a distance from apostolic times, take up this prayer in the *same light*, and expect with equal confidence its fulfilment? This inquiry may be fully answered by the following considerations:—1. The church of Christ is a society of godly people subsisting in various places, through all ages. 2. The sacred writings were given to the *church* of Christ. 3. Those writings do not come to a *particular people*, in a *particular place*; much less to *individuals*, *nominally* or *specifically* considered; but they are sent to *characters* and *circumstances*. 4. All persons, therefore,

of the *same character*, or in the *same religious state*, and all who are in the *same circumstances*, are those contemplated by the Divine Spirit in the Revelation which he has given. If then, we are in the *same spiritual state*—wish for the *same blessings*—and look to the *same unchanged God*, through that Christ who is the *same yesterday, to-day, and for ever*; we have an *equal interest* in these promises, may claim their fulfilment, and considering ourselves in the place of the *Philippians*, receive with meekness that engrafted word, which is able to make us wise unto salvation, pp. 101, 102.

When the apostle prays that ‘they may be sincere and without offence,’ he prays that their *heart* may be *always right before God*; and their *conduct* always *unblamable before MEN*. These *two* constitute the character of the perfect Christian:—The character of him in whose heart Christ dwells by faith; and whose actions are governed by the *law of love* to God and man.

This purity is not to last for a *day*, or a particular time merely, but during the *whole of life—till the day of Christ*; i. e. the day in which Christ shall come to judge the world.” p. 110.

It will be recollected that, according to Dr. Clarke, this is a prophetic prayer for all true believers, so far as it is applicable to their circumstances; and (whatever may be true as to the circumstances for gaining knowledge,) it is surely applicable to the *circumstances of all* to continue in *love* “till the day of Christ.”

Christ’s intercessory prayer for his disciples and for all who should ever believe on his name, is the passage which is most directly and indisputably in point, for the proof of this doctrine in this particular manner. All must admit *Christ’s* prayer on that occasion, as prophetic, whatever they may be disposed to say of the prayers of his apostles. We wish Dr. Clarke had selected that wonderful passage for the purpose. None can doubt its applicability to all believers in every age.

Again, on 1 Peter i, 3–5, speaking of the incorruptible and unfading inheritance;

“But for *whom* is it kept? Ans. For *them who are kept by the power of God*: τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ φρουρουμένους—for *them who are defended as in a fortress by the power of God*. There is a remarkable correspondence between the *two verbs* used in this sentence: the first verb, τηρέω, signifies, to *keep watch, guard*; and τηρησις, is a *place of custody, or prison*; and the other verb, φρουρέω, from φρουρος, a *sentinel*, signifies to *keep as under a military guard*. The true disciples of Christ are under the continual *watchful care* of God; and the inheritance is *guarded* for them. In some countries *military posts* are continually kept upon the *confines*, in order to prevent irruptions from a neighboring people; and in many places *heirs*, while in their *minority*, are kept in *fortified places*, under *military guards*, lest they should sustain any injury, or be carried away.

The *heirs*, in the text, are *kept by the power of God*; ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ, by the *mighty miraculous power of God*; for nothing less is necessary to keep and preserve in this state of continual trial, a soul from the contagion that is in the world. God’s *providence* is the *safe place*, and

God's *power* is the *guard* in that safe place. As it requires the same power to *preserve* that it required to *create*, so nothing less than the sovereign power of God will suffice to keep that soul in a state of *purity*, which that power has *purified*. Thus the *power* and *grace* which save us are still necessary to *keep us* in the *saved state*.

But *how* is this power *exerted*? Ans. By *faith*. He that shall ultimately get the inheritance, is he who shall be found *faithful* unto death. *Faith* interests the power of God in behalf of his followers: and the power of God *preserves* the *inheritance* for the *man*, and the *man* for the *inheritance*. No persevering without this *power*, and no *power* without *faith*. The oracle of God is, '*Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life.*' This is *salvation*, redemption from sin in and during life, and glory after death," p. 289.

This [add the gentlemen,] is all we wish any man to say on perseverance.' pp. 580-82.

We hope, then, that on *this* point also, we shall now and hereafter, be left in peace; for what Dr. Clarke has thus said 'on perseverance,' we say, and Arminius, Wesley, Fletcher, and the Methodists, have in effect always said. '*If faithful to the grace by which they were thus favored,*' says Dr. Clarke,—'*if* in the same spiritual state, [with these Philippians,]—wishing for the same blessings,—looking to the same unchanged God,—through that Christ who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever,' if 'true believers' whose '*faith* interests the power of God' in their behalf,—'Christ's disciples'—'followers,'—'faithful unto death,'—for such, indeed, to the end of the world, the intercessory prayers of the inspired apostles, and especially of our great High Priest, who ever liveth our Advocate above, are equivalent to the most direct and precious promises, and will surely be fulfilled, and in no stinted measure. *Such* true and faithful believers, God's almighty power preserves for the inheritance, and the inheritance for them; and nothing short of this power (not only *will* do it, but) *can* do it. '*No persevering without this power, and no power without faith.*' This is Methodist doctrine, to the best of our humble knowledge and belief, and always has been. But we fear we shall yet be compelled to see and to deplore, that it is *not* (uniformly at least) the doctrine of the Christian Spectator.

3. It would seem strange if, 'after all,' the gentlemen shall be found, on that most obnoxious, ridiculed, and misrepresented of all our tenets, *Christian perfection*, far more ultra perfectionists, in fact, than ourselves. We do not here use simply the term 'perfection' as the Spectator does, because thus used, it is peculiarly liable to misconception and abuse. Simple, absolute perfection, in any creature, no Methodist of sound mind certainly ever yet held. Hence, though the sneer of Mr. Southey, adopted by the Spectator,—'a perfection which, after all, is *no* perfection,'—may seem smart, and serve to amuse the profane and frivolous, yet it will never pass for argument with meek and sober Christians. The point in question is '*Christian perfection.*' This

is the phrase of our choice, and to which honest opponents ought to confine themselves. And what we mean by it is,—that state of thorough renewal in the spirit of our mind, in righteousness and true holiness, which, (according to our understanding of the Bible,) the blood, and word, and Spirit of Christ, and nothing short of these, are intended, and are competent, to effect for us, and in us, in this life. That ‘Paul, who was probably at least as holy as any man now upon earth, disavows all claim to such perfection,’ we deny. The *Christian Spectator* may, indeed, use the term ‘perfection,’ simply and absolutely, in a sense which our standard writers uniformly disavow. In this way they may contend with a shadow of their own raising, and fight as those that beat the air. But let them take our phrase, ‘Christian perfection,’ with the explanations given of it by Wesley and Fletcher, and if they please they may add Dr. Clarke. Then let them assert that ‘the Bible’ teaches no such thing, and that ‘Paul’ disavows it. On this ground, whenever they are prepared to come up to it, honestly and candidly, we are prepared to meet them. And this is the only fair ground in waging a war on us. As to the ‘experience’ or the ‘observation’ of the gentlemen themselves, we cannot be answerable for these; nor should we be willing to try the question on that issue.

But, while they oppose and ridicule our evangelical views of this doctrine, they nevertheless go much farther than we do in asserting the thing, though on a principle, in our judgment, most abhorrent to the whole spirit and genius of Christianity,—allowing that, as we apprehend them, to be within the unaided powers of the natural fallen man, which they will not admit that the blood, and Spirit, and word of Christ ever have effected or ever will effect for any human being in this world.

‘We agree [say the gentlemen,] that God’s law requires us to be perfect, and that its requirements are righteous. Of course we agree that man has the requisite ability to become perfect. Perfection is, in its *nature attainable* at any stage in this life, and ought so to be preached with all possible urgency. We mean such a perfection as fits the pardoned soul for heaven. “Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.” Whoever does not attain to this, is guilty of sin for the abuse of his faculties and the neglect of his means. He is of course to be charged with the full guilt, and not pitied for the mere misfortune.’ pp. 578–9.

Now the reader will mark that the gentlemen say all this of ‘man,’—of man indefinitely;—of course of all mankind. That they mean thus much, too, and mean it of man in his natural, unaided, and unrenewed state, we do not doubt. This is, in fact, as we shall hereafter have occasion to show, the capital heresy of their whole scheme,—an utter abandonment, in this respect, (greatly we conceive for the worse,) of the infinitely more evangelical platform of old Calvinism,—and all plainly a pure fable,

wholly unwarranted by a single text in God's Revelation; invented, not to support the *bona fide* possibility of the salvation of all men, but a mere nominal possibility, as a plausible pretext for the damnation of the non-elect,—in plain English, the reprobate. That by man's requisite ability to become perfect,—at any stage in this life,—the gentlemen do not mean any ability derived from the influence of saving grace,—or of God's Holy Spirit, is plain from the entire tenor of their work. To admit this of 'man' indefinitely,—meaning truly all mankind, would overturn from the foundation their whole fabric, and crush in its ruin that darling idol Hopkinsian 'election,' and her deformed, cloaked, yet inseparable sister Calvinian reprobation. Hence, of necessity, we understand the gentlemen to say that man,—at any stage in this life, has, of himself, without God's saving grace or Spirit, the requisite ability to become perfect. In a later number of their work, the gentlemen, indeed, after stating that holiness is the indispensable condition of salvation, explicitly add that all 'have full power and ability to comply with this condition, without the slightest intervention of electing grace.' Nay, in one place, (vol. ii, p. 419,) they distinctly assert that 'the natural faculties of the soul—confer all the ability that he [man] can possess or need' 'to exercise holy affections.' This seems to us to render the influence of grace and of the Holy Spirit, as a source of either natural or moral ability to exercise holy affections, not only needless, but impracticable. For if the natural faculties of the soul confer *all* the ability that man *can possess* or *need* for this purpose, then he can neither *need* nor *possess any* ability from any other source. If this be *evangelical* doctrine, we confess we have hitherto read our Bible in vain. If it be not even beyond the most ultra Pelagianism, we have yet to learn what Pelagianism is. Luther would have abhorred it. Calvin would have abhorred it. Arminius would have abhorred it. Wesley would have abhorred it. The Church of England, the Protestant Episcopal Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, a large portion (would we could say the whole) of the Presbyterian Church, abhor it. No denomination, that we know of, pretending to the character of evangelical, holds it, except such of the Congregational churches, (or perhaps more properly Congregational ministers) of New-England, as concur in the system of the Christian Spectator. And none we believe ever have held it but such as the great body of the pious lovers of the Bible have, uniformly, from the beginning, held to be heretical. Should the gentlemen, in consequence of these remarks, think proper to charge us with descending to the *argumentum ad invidiam*, and demand of us reasons and not names, we answer, that we shall give them both. We give the names here, and shall add the reasons hereafter. And in the mean time we say, in the language of the 'Biblical Repertory,' that although we regard the Bible as the sole standard of the religion of Protestants, and that it matters little what men have taught or

rejected, if the word of God does not support their doctrines, yet, 'While we hold that the opinions of men are of no authority as to matters of faith, we, at the same time, believe that much respect is due to uniform opinions of the people of God; that there is a strong presumption in favor of any doctrine being taught in the Bible, if the great body of the pious readers of the Bible have from the beginning believed and loved it.' Such we think has been the doctrine of fallen man's utter helplessness without grace.

As to the speculations of the gentlemen respecting the moral agency of lost souls in the prison of despair, (which apply equally to the angels that sinned,) we again request them to recur to the declaration of the aged Moses, and to be contented with what is 'revealed,' on that 'awful subject.' So far as we recollect, the Scriptures uniformly represent the retributions of eternity as poured out on those miserable spirits, not because they do not do their duty in hell, and thus escape from that prison of despair and enter on eternal life, (the instant practicability of which for every soul of them seems to be the notion of the gentlemen,) but for their sins and impenitence and their final rejection of all the offers of mercy and grace during their probation in this life. If the gentlemen deny this to be the Scripture view of the subject, we are prepared to argue it. If they admit it, the dispute is ended. That this doctrine, however, implies that those beings have no power of feeling a sense of sin, of knowing why they suffer, or of condemning themselves, is an assumption wholly gratuitous, and unwarranted by any 'scheme of Arminianism' within our knowledge.

The gentlemen say that 'Dr. Clarke as a good Methodist, holds to perfection and assurance.'—'We think it clear [they add,] that he means to hold to a *bona fide* perfection, and a perfect assurance. It would seem, too, that such is his doctrine, not merely with reference to a few, of rare attainments, but with reference to every individual, who has any grace at all. The third particular under the second head just quoted, expresses this idea, if it is possible to express it.'—p. 578. Could any thing be more absurd?—that 'every individual who has any grace at all' is perfect! Dr. Clarke says no such thing. 'The third particular under the second head—expresses' no such 'idea.'

We agree with the Christian Spectator that 'to encourage young converts to think themselves perfect' has a baleful tendency. But when the gentlemen add, 'such sermons as these [of Dr. Clarke's,] are directly fitted to produce and foster this presumption,' they do Dr. Clarke very great injustice. Perhaps, however, in deference to the professional character of the gentlemen, we are bound to allow somewhat to them for figures of speech, as when, for example, they insinuate that Dr. Clarke represents Adam, before his fall, as having been omniscient,—'that *Adam knew every thing.*' In such cases we take it for granted that the gentlemen speak as rhetoricians, and not as Christian Spectators,—much less as Christian divines.

In the passage alluded to, Dr. Clarke was speaking simply of the 'Spirit of adoption,'—the testimony of our being 'in the Divine favor.'

'This adoption [he says,] is manifested to believers *two ways* : I. **NEGATIVELY** ; and II. **POSITIVELY**.

I. NEGATIVELY.

1. By the removal of their guilt—giving them ease and peace of conscience.

2. By taking away their darkness, and diffusing throughout their souls His heavenly light.

3. By removing their burthensome miserable sense of guilt, so that they no longer feel self condemnation, beyond which, the soul cannot suffer an evil more distressing on this side eternity. Hence they feel no longer that dreadful apprehension of God's wrath ; that fearful looking for a fiery indignation that shall devour the adversaries.

II. POSITIVELY.

1. The Holy Spirit is sent forth to witness with their spirit. He is to bear His testimony *where* it is absolutely *necessary*—*where* it can be properly *discerned*—*where* it can be *fully understood*—*and where* it cannot be *mistaken* :—viz. *in their hearts* ; or, as St. Paul says, Rom. viii, 16, "the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit." The *Spirit* of God with the *spirit* of man—*Spirit* with *spirit*—Intelligence with intelligence,—the testimony given and received by the same kind of agency. A Spiritual agent in a spiritual substance.

2. This *witness* is not borne in their *passions*, nor in impressions made upon their *imagination* ; for this must be from its very nature doubtful and evanescent : but it is borne in their understanding, not by a transitory manifestation, but continually : unless a man by sins of omission or commission grieve that Divine Spirit, and cause Him to withdraw His *testimony*, which is the same thing as the *Divine approbation*. And God cannot continue to the soul a sense of his *approbation*, when it has departed from the holy commandment that was given to it. But even in this case the man may return by repentance and faith to God, through Christ, when pardon will be granted and the witness restored.

3. Wherever this Spirit comes, it bears a testimony to *itself*. It shows that it is the Divine Spirit by its own light ; and he who receives it is perfectly satisfied of this. It brings a light, a power, and conviction, more full, more clear, and more convincing to the understanding and judgment, than they ever had, or ever can have, of any circumstance or fact brought before the intellect. The man knows that it is the Divine Spirit, and he knows and feels that it bears testimony to the state of grace in which he stands.'—*Discourse on Gal. iv, 4-7.*

'The Divine Spirit — bears testimony to the state of grace [viz. of adoption,] in which he [the adopted individual] stands.' This is the doctrine of Dr. Clarke, and of the passage specially referred to by the Christian Spectator. And what 'reasons' have the gentlemen urged against it ?—nay, what 'names' even ? or, if the doctrine, though reluctantly, be admitted at all, on what

authority do the gentlemen confine it 'to a few, of rare attainments?' Surely not on that of St. Paul, who says,—'And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.—Now, not to name here the many other scriptures which might easily be adduced in proof of the same truth, if the fact of sonship be the 'reason,' or cause, as the Apostle asserts, of the sending of the Spirit of Christ into the believing heart, uttering there the cry of filial confidence, or assurance, does not the 'reason' equally apply to all the 'sons'? Alas! how soon have the gentlemen again forgotten 'that memorable declaration of the aged Moses'! Our Calvinian opponents generally, indeed, seem to misapprehend (we wish it may not be that any wilfully misrepresent) our doctrine of Christian assurance,—applying what we speak of a *present state of grace*, to *final and eternal salvation*. It would be a curious, if not an edifying, exercise, to trace the fluctuations of their own creed on this capital and evangelical doctrine. Formerly, it was considered by the Christian Church generally, as the common privilege of believers. But, after Arminius had begun to show the absurdity of Calvin's additions to the gospel, the rigid predestinarians resolved to remodel this doctrine of personal assurance, and to make it one of the bulwarks of their own system. In order to this, instead of allowing it to remain the scriptural criterion of a believer's present experience and actual enjoyment in God, as Arminius did, they employed it to work themselves up to a persuasion of their individual personal election, and consequently, according to their system, to a complete certainty of their final perseverance. But when, at a later period, they found it to be untenable in this shape, they abandoned both the sound part of the doctrine, and, for the most part, their own additions also, and then began to teach it as barely the extraordinary and uncommon privilege of 'a few of rare attainments,' even among 'the elect.*' But where it is written 'thus saith the Lord,' or any of his inspired penmen, they have never been pleased to condescend to tell us. And as the gentlemen of the Spectator have not thought proper to adduce either reasons or names in opposition to that genuine Christian assurance of present grace, enjoyed by God's adopted children, which Dr. Clarke, 'as a good Methodist,' does hold and teach, we shall for the present pass to another topic.

The gentlemen have thought proper to insinuate that the system of Methodism denies the 'proper omniscience' and 'the strict immutability' of Jehovah. They say this first, apparently, of Dr. Clarke, whom, however, they represent as 'the oracle of Methodism.' Yet, as if this sideway insinuation of the matter were not plain enough, for those of their 'readers not extensively versed in the doctrines of Methodism,' they are careful to place these in direct connexion with what they allege to be Dr. Clarke's view of the subject. We say then, first, and as distinctly as we can, that

* See Nichols's Notes on the Works of Arminius, vol. i, pp. 603-14.

the gentlemen, in our opinion, greatly misapprehend or greatly misrepresent Dr. Clarke; and, secondly, that the doctrine which they here impute to Dr. Clarke is not the doctrine of 'Methodism.' Dr. Clarke does not 'deny God's proper omniscience,' or 'the strict immutability of Jehovah;' and certainly 'Methodism' does neither.

In regard to Dr. Clarke, we might safely rest his defence, as to the mere question of fact, whether he does or does not 'deny God's proper omniscience,' on the Christian Spectator's own glaring contradiction of its own charge. In the quotation which the gentlemen give from Dr. Clarke's commentary on the second chapter of Acts, he does indeed aver that God's knowledge, properly, is neither '*fore*' nor '*after*' knowledge, in reference to *himself*, but in reference to *us*. Yet he as expressly asserts that 'omniscience—is an attribute of God:—that 'God is omniscient;—although as he 'exists in all that can be called *eternity*,—nothing can be *future* to *him*, because he lives in all *futurity*: nothing can be *past* to *him*, because he equally exists in all *past time*:—and that with him 'all that is *past*, and all that is *present*, and all that is *future* to *man*, exists in one infinite, indivisible, and eternal now.' 'What, then, [we use the language of the Christian Spectator itself, p. 565,] can possibly be meant by the eternal now? *Plainly nothing but the perfect omniscience of God*, which, at one intuitive and changeless view, beholds the past, the present, and the future.' Yet, while the gentlemen charge Dr. Clarke with denying God's proper omniscience, they in the same breath charge him with holding the '*eternal now*,' and censure him for it too, although they themselves declare that the '*eternal now*,' '*plainly*,' cannot possibly mean any thing '*but the perfect omniscience of God!*'

We have no wish to conceal the fact that Dr. Clarke's critique on the *term* omniscience, is not satisfactory to us, and never was. Of all the criticisms, indeed, in his most valuable and learned work, this identical one, on which the Christian Spectator has had the sagacity to fix its fangs, always appeared to us the least defensible. What the doctrines of 'Methodism,' on this awful subject, are, we shall presently state, from which it may appear that it does not cause us quite so much 'embarrassment and distress' as the gentlemen seem to suppose; although we marvel at the levity with which they allow themselves to jeer the reverence of Dr. Clarke's language in relation to an attribute of Jehovah.

Dr. Clarke's design in the note on Acts ii, evidently was, not to deny God's proper omniscience, but to show that in his view, this attribute is consistent with the knowledge of *contingent* things *as contingent*, and not *as absolutely certain*. 'By *absolutely certain*, [says Dr. Clarke,] I mean a thing which *must* be in that *order*, *time*, *place*, and *form*, in which Divine Wisdom has ordained it to be; and that it can be no *otherwise* than this infinite counsel has ordained. By *contingent*, I mean such things as the infinite wisdom of God has thought proper to poise on the *possibility* of *being* or

not being, leaving it to the will of intelligent beings to turn the scale.'—*Note on Acts ii.* Now as Dr. Clarke has thus clearly defined the sense in which he uses the terms in the place in question, we are bound in all candour, to take them, as used by him, in the sense in which he himself explains them. And the reader may perhaps be somewhat startled to hear that, in this sense, the *Christian Spectator*, after all, explicitly avers its agreement with 'the amount of what he [Dr. Clarke,] says on the point.'

'The amount [say the gentlemen,] of what he [Dr. Clarke,] says on the point, is this. God has ordained involuntary acts, as "absolutely certain;" and voluntary acts, "as contingent;" and, therefore, it is absurd to suppose that he foreknows either class of them, in any other sense than that in which he has ordained it. To all this, we give our hearty *amen*. In *this* sense we are willing to adopt the word *contingent*; and if Dr. Clarke and his brethren are willing to abide by this sense throughout all the relations of these doctrines, the dispute is ended. And we verily hope that in this way it will be ended at last.' p. 569.

Why then does the *Christian Spectator* yet find so much fault with Dr. Clarke? Be it that his criticism on the *term* omniscience, is not a happy one, as we agree in thinking; yet this certainly no more proves that he denies the attribute itself, in its proper sense, when we take into view also his subsequent definitions of his other terms, than his peculiar idea respecting the *term* 'Son,' in relation to Christ, proves that he denies his proper and eternal Godhead, or the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. If 'the amount' of what Dr. Clarke says on the point is plain, and that 'amount' be correct, as the *Christian Spectator* itself thinks, then, with Dr. Clarke at least, let the gentlemen's dispute be 'ended.'

And why, if they will be consistent, may it not, on this point, as well be ended with 'Methodism' also? The gentlemen have quoted at large Dr. Clarke's extract from Bird's *Conferences*, at the close of his observations on *Acts ii.*, and which he calls 'a good argument.' They then say, 'We have only to add that this extract from Mr. Bird expresses our own views.' Mr. Bird was answering the objection, 'If many things fall out *contingently*, or as it were, by *accident*, God's *foreknowledge* of them can be but *contingent*, dependent on *man's free will*. To this he replies,

'It is one thing to know that a thing will be done necessarily; and another to know necessarily, that a thing will be done. God doth necessarily foreknow all that will be done; but he doth not know, that those things which shall be done voluntarily, will be done necessarily: he knoweth that they will be done: but he knoweth withal, that they might have fallen out otherwise, for aught he had ordered to the contrary. So likewise, God knew that Adam would fall: and yet he knew that he would not fall necessarily; for it was possible for him not to have fallen. And as touching God's pre-ordination going before his prescience, as the cause of all events: this would be

to make God the author of all the sin in the world ; his knowledge comprehending that, as well as other things. God, indeed, foreknoweth all things, because they will be done ; but things are not (therefore) done, because he foreknoweth them. It is impossible that any man, by his voluntary manner of working, should elude God's foresight ; but then, this foresight doth not necessitate the will : for this were, to take it wholly away. For as the knowledge of things present, imports no necessity on that which is done ; so, the foreknowledge of things future, lays no necessity on that which shall be : because, whosoever knows and sees things, he knows and sees them as they are, and not as they are not : so that God's knowledge doth not confound things, but reaches to all events, not only which come to pass, but as they come to pass, whether contingently or necessarily. As for example : when you see a man walking upon the earth, and at the very same instant the sun's shining in the heavens ; do you not see the first as voluntary, and the second as natural ? And though at the instant you see both done, there is a necessity that they be done, (or else you could not see them at all ;) yet there was a necessity of one only, before they were done, (namely, the sun's shining in the heavens,) but none at all of the other, (viz. the man's walking upon the earth.) The sun could not but shine, as being a natural agent ; the man might not have walked, as being a voluntary one.'

If this extract expresses the views of the Christian Spectator, then, in this respect also, have the conductors of that work abandoned the ground of old Calvinism, which, in order to support its doctrine of absolute predestination, denied the possibility of the prescience of future contingencies.* The views of Methodism on this subject may be seen in the following extract from Mr. Watson's Theological Institutes.

'The Omniscience of God [says Mr. Watson,] is constantly connected in Scripture with his Omnipresence, and forms a part of almost every description of that attribute ; for as God is a spirit, and therefore intelligent, if he is every where, if nothing can exclude him, not even the most solid bodies, nor the minds of intelligent beings, then are all things "naked and opened to the eyes of him with whom we have to do." "Where he acts, he is, and where he is, he perceives." "He understands and considers things absolutely, and as they are in their own natures, powers, properties, differences, together with all the circumstances belonging to them." "Known unto him are all his works from the beginning of the world," rather, *απ' αἰῶνος*, from all eternity—known, before they were made, in their *possible*, and known, now they are made, in their *actual* existence. "Lord, thou hast searched me and known me ; thou knowest my down-sitting and mine up-rising, thou understandest my thought afar off. Thou compassest my path and my lying down, and art acquainted with all my ways. For there is not a word in my tongue, but lo, O Lord, thou knowest it altogether.—The darkness hideth not from thee ; but the night shineth as the day.—The ways of man are before the eyes of the

* We use the term 'old' in reference to Calvinism, in this article, simply to distinguish it from the modern Hopkinsian Calvinism.

Lord, and he pondereth all his goings ; he searcheth their hearts, and understandeth every imagination of their thoughts." Nor is this perfect knowledge to be confined to men, or angels, it reaches into the state of the dead, and penetrates the regions of the damned. Hell, *hades*, is naked before him ; and destruction (*the seats of destruction*) hath no covering." No limits at all are to be set to this perfection. "Great is the Lord, *his understanding is INFINITE.*" *Theological Institutes*, vol. i, p. 412.

'The foreknowledge of God, or his prescience of future things, though contingent, is by divines generally included in the term omniscience, and for this they have unquestionably the authority of the holy Scriptures. From the difficulty which has been supposed to exist, in reconciling this with the freedom of human actions, and man's accountability, some have however refused to allow *prescience*, at least of contingent actions, to be a property of the Divine Nature ; and others have adopted various modifications of opinion, as to the knowledge of God, in order to elude, or to remove the objection.' *Ib.* p. 416.

'That the subject is incomprehensible as to the *manner* in which the Divine Being foreknows future events of this or of any kind, even the greatest minds, which have applied themselves to such speculations, have felt and acknowledged. The fact, that such a property exists in the Divine Nature, is however, too clearly stated in Scripture to allow of any doubt in those who are disposed to submit to its authority ; and it is not left to the uncertainty of our speculations on the properties of spiritual natures, either to be confirmed or disproved. Equally clear is it that the moral actions of men are not necessitated, because human accountability is the main pillar of that moral government, whose principles, conduct, and ends are stated so largely in Divine revelation. Whatever, therefore, becomes of human speculations, these points are sufficiently settled on an authority which is abundantly sufficient. To the objection of metaphysicians of different classes, against either of these principles, that such is not the sense of the Scriptures, because the fact "*cannot be so, it involves a contradiction,*" not the least importance is to be attached, when the plain, concurrent, and uniform sense of Scripture, interpreted as any other book would be interpreted, determines to the contrary. It surely does not follow that a thing cannot be, because *men* do not see, or pretend not to see, that it *can be*. This would lay the foundation of our faith in the strength or weakness of other men's intellect. We are not, however, in many cases, left wholly to this answer, and it may be shown that the position, that *certain* prescience destroys *contingency*, is a mere sophism, and that this conclusion is connected with the premise, by a confused use of terms.

The great fallacy in the argument, that the certain prescience of a moral action destroys its contingent nature, lies in supposing that *contingency* and *certainly* are the opposites of each other. It is, perhaps, unfortunate that a word which is of figurative etymology, and which consequently can only have an ideal application to such subjects, should have grown into common use in this discussion, because it is more liable, on that account, to present itself to different minds under

different shades of meaning. If, however, the term *contingent* in this controversy has any definite meaning at all, as applied to the moral actions of men, it must mean their *freedom*, and stands opposed not to *certainty*, but to *necessity*. A free action is a voluntary one; and an action which results from the choice of the agent, is distinguished from a necessary one in this, that it might not have been, or have been otherwise, according to the self-determining power of the agent. It is with reference to this specific quality of a free action, that the term contingency is used,—*it might have been otherwise*, in other words, it was not necessitated. Contingency in moral actions is, therefore, their *freedom*, and is opposed, not to *certainty* but to *necessity*. The very nature of this controversy fixes this as the precise meaning of the term. The question is not, in point of fact, about the *certainty* of moral actions, that is, whether they *will* happen or not; but about the nature of them, whether free or constrained, whether they *must* happen or not. Those who advocate this theory, care not about the *certainty* of actions, simply considered, that is, whether they will take place or not; the reason why they object to a certain prescience of moral actions, is, that they conclude, that such a prescience renders them *necessary*. It is the *quality* of the action for which they contend, not whether it will happen or not. If contingency meant *uncertainty*, the sense in which such theorists take it, the dispute would be at an end. But though an *uncertain* action cannot be foreseen as certain, a free, unnecessitated action may; for there is nothing in the knowledge of the action, in the least, to affect its nature. Simple knowledge is, in no sense, a cause of action, nor can it be conceived to be causal, unconnected with *exerted* power; for mere knowledge, therefore, an action remains free or necessitated as the case may be. A necessitated action is not made a voluntary one by its being foreknown; a free action is not made a necessary one. Free actions foreknown, will not, therefore, cease to be contingent. But how stands the case as to their *certainty*? Precisely on the same ground. The certainty of a *necessary* action, foreknown, does not result from the knowledge of the action, but from the operation of the necessitating cause; and in like manner, the certainty of a *free* action does not result from the knowledge of it, which is no cause at all, but from the voluntary cause, that is, the determination of the will. It alters not the case in the least, to say that the voluntary action might have been otherwise. Had it been otherwise, the knowledge of it would have been otherwise; but as the will, which gives birth to the action, is not dependent upon the previous knowledge of God, but the knowledge of the action upon foresight of the choice of the will, neither the will nor the act is controlled by the knowledge, and the action, though foreseen, is still free or contingent.

The foreknowledge of God has then no influence upon either the freedom or the certainty of actions, for this plain reason, that it is *knowledge*, and not *influence*; and actions may be certainly foreknown, without their being rendered necessary by that foreknowledge.' *Ib.* pp. 420–22.

Such, on this point, are the doctrines of 'Methodism,' because we believe them to be the doctrines of *the Bible*; and to *that* authority, wherever it may lead us, we shall always bow.

The gentlemen of the *Spectator*, however, would fain persuade us that Dr. Clarke's object is 'simply to escape the *doctrine of divine decrees* ;—which, [say they] after all, he is compelled to admit, on his own principles.' Most certainly. But they add 'and for aught we can see, to admit in just the *sense we hold to them.*' This is another matter : let us look at it a little closer.

If modern Hopkinsian Calvinism be distinguished by any one peculiarly remarkable characteristic, it is, we think, that of the dialectical dexterity by which its 'distinguished teachers' hope to evade the galling fire by which open old Calvinism has so long been 'embarrassed and distressed.' Its strange, and, as we think, unscriptural and antichristian subtleties, have struck us indeed with so much amazement, as coming from gentlemen assuming to be peculiarly evangelical, that we have been almost afraid to trust our own understanding of them, and have looked at them again and again, to endeavour, if possible, to comprehend them justly. We find, however, that the conductors of another quarterly journal, '*The Biblical Repertory and Theological Review,*' regard the chief of them very nearly if not quite in the same light with ourselves. The *Biblical Repertory* is, moreover, a decidedly Presbyterian and Calvinistic journal, but of the old school, and is conducted by an association of gentlemen in and near Princeton, (N. J.) with distinguished ability, and, as far as we have perceived, with a commendable degree of courtesy and moderation. That, as a Presbyterian work, it is openly and frankly Calvinistic in its character, detracts not a particle from its merit in our estimation. We esteem it the more on this account ; and though we cannot of course concur in its Calvinian peculiarities, yet its language is such that no one is deceived by it, and on the vital, leading doctrines, which distinguish the great body of evangelical Christians, it is happily consistent and firm in their support. Far otherwise, as we conceive, is the fact with regard to the *Christian Spectator*, of which we shall briefly adduce what we consider the proof, when we have first disposed of this said doctrine of 'the divine decrees,' which the gentlemen are desirous to make us believe, 'the oracle of Methodism' admits just in the sense in which they 'hold to them.'

The *Christian Spectator*, with Pelagius, denies the doctrine that infants are born with a depraved moral nature. Nay, the gentlemen go much farther on this point than Pelagius himself. They deny also, that the universality and certainty of sin, in human creatures of every age and generation, after individuals become personally capable of moral action, is the result either of imitation, (as the Pelagians vainly talked,) or of accidental circumstances. How then, according to their theory, do they account for this striking and undeniable phenomenon in the moral history of man ? If the universality and certainty of sin, which displays itself in the whole of the fallen progeny of Adam, in every age and clime, under whatever infinitely varied circumstances of birth, of educa-

tion, or of after life, be not the result of some common root of bitterness, of some universal taint or corruption of moral nature, antecedently to the actual transgressions of each individual, and be not either the result of imitation or of circumstances, whence is it? how else is it accounted for?—The answer of the *Christian Spectator* is,—it is the result ‘of a divine constitution:’—(that is, of a divine appointment or decree;)—‘A divine constitution, [says the *Biblical Repertory*, in quoting this passage from the *Christian Spectator*,] which secures “the universality and certainty of sin;” and that too with undeviating and remorseless effect:’—a ‘divine constitution’ founded in ‘mere sovereignty:’—a ‘horrible decree’ which seems too horrible even for our friends of the old Calvinistic school.

‘For ourselves, however, [says the *Biblical Repertory*, after quoting this sentiment from the *Christian Spectator*,] we are free to confess, that we instinctively shrink from the idea, that God in mere sovereignty inflicts the most tremendous evils upon his creatures; while we bow submissively at the thought of their being penal inflictions for a sin committed by our natural head and representative, and in violation of a covenant, in which, by a benevolent appointment of God, we were included. Besides, is it not necessary that a moral being should have a probation before his fate is decided? When had men this probation? Not, according to Dr. Dwight, in their own persons, for they are born depraved, and consequently under condemnation. Not in Adam—for this supposes that his sin forfeited for us the Divine favour, or is the ground of our condemnation; but this is imputation. Is it then more unjust to condemn mankind for the act of their natural representative, in whom they had a fair and favorable probation, than to condemn them without any such probation? Determine, out of mere sovereignty, to call them into existence depraved, and then condemn them for this depravity? Nor does the *Spectator*’s view much relieve the difficulty. For a probation to be fair, must afford as favorable a prospect of a happy as of an unhappy conclusion. But men are brought up to their trial, under a “divine constitution” which secures the certainty of their sinning; and this is done because an individual sinned thousands of years before the vast majority of them were born. Is this a fair trial? Would not any man in his senses prefer to have his fate decided, by the act of his first father, in the full perfection of his powers, intellectual and moral, than to have it suspended on his own first faltering moral act of infancy, performed under a constitution which secures its being sinful? According to the *Spectator*, therefore, the probation of man is the most unfavorable possible for that portion of the race which arrives at moral agency; and those who die before it, never have any, at least not in this world. The race as such is not fallen: for this implies the loss of original righteousness and of the Divine favor. The former, however, was never possessed; the latter, by one half mankind never forfeited, and for them no Saviour can be needed.’ pp. 465–6.

We have cited this passage from the *Biblical Repertory* in full, as exhibiting at once both the theory of old Calvinism, and the diverse

scheme of the Christian Spectator, though grafted on other peculiar dogmas of the Calvinian school. Our doctrine, that man is born morally depraved, does not labour under the embarrassment which the Biblical Repertory seems to suppose. We hold that all infants dying in infancy, before they are capable of personal moral action, participate in the benefit of Christ's death,—the 'free gift' coming upon them unto justification of life. That, as they are involved in the condemnation and the corrupt nature of their fallen progenitor, without personal knowledge of him, or any individual moral action on their own part, so also do they partake of the saving efficacy of the atoning sacrifice and grace of Christ, without personal knowledge of him, or a capacity of personal moral action. With regard to others, all those who attain a capacity of individual moral agency, their 'probation is fair, and affords as favorable a prospect of a happy as of an unhappy conclusion.' For though sin abounds, yet grace for *all*, without mental reservation or unworthy trickery, on the part of our most high heavenly Father,—sincere, genuine, saving grace,—the only grace worth the name,—much more abounds. We wish we could perceive this, really and truly, in the scheme of our Calvinian friends, of either the old or new school. But we do not. Yet our present business is with the 'decrees' of the Christian Spectator. And we think it will cost the gentlemen no small pains yet, to show that Dr. Clarke, (or 'Arminians,') holds these 'in just the sense' they do.

Another material point of difference between Dr. Clarke and the Christian Spectator on this subject, we apprehend, is in respect to the 'decree' of 'election,'—that gratuitous election of 'mere sovereignty,' which, as Calvin says, 'is but half displayed till we come to particular individuals, to whom God not only offers salvation, but *assigns* it' by his eternal sovereign decree. The inseparable twin doctrine of eternal, absolute, sovereign *reprobation* of particular individuals to eternal death, by a correlate 'decree,' we know the Christian Spectator, and its modern coadjutors, are greatly anxious to get rid of. Calvin himself, however, more honestly admitted such an attempt to be 'puerile and absurd.'—'Many, indeed, [says Calvin,] as if they wished to avert odium from God, admit election in such a way as to deny that any one is reprobated. But this is puerile and absurd; because election itself could not exist, without being opposed to reprobation.—Whom God passes by, therefore, he reprobates, and from no other cause than his determination to exclude them from the inheritance which he predestines for his children.' (Institutes, Book iii, Chap. 23, Allen's translation.) This is candid, and infinitely more honorable than the efforts of some modern theologues to conceal from view the hideous *preterition* decree, which, after all, is, in their scheme, precisely the same to all practical effects, as in that of Calvin.

It is true the Christian Spectator maintains that '*all* have the power to do their duty, and *thus* to enter on eternal life.' p. 576.

But then the wary reader, if he would not be misled, must be careful to observe that the only power which the Christian Spectator means as possessed by 'all' to 'do their duty, and thus to enter on eternal life,' is the *natural* power of fallen man, *without grace*!—a power which, 'after all,' is no power. God, they contend, as a 'sovereign,' (that is arbitrarily, and from no other cause than his own mere will,) dispenses his saving grace to a part only; whilst all the rest, left to themselves under a 'divine constitution' which, with grim and remorseless efficacy, in execution of the decree, secures the 'universality and certainty' of their sin, 'will certainly and righteously perish.' Supposing such a 'divine constitution,' the 'certainly' we admit:—the 'righteously' we deny. Such a scheme, in our estimation, is a mockery of common sense; an insult to Him who will judge the world in righteousness and the people with equity; and in direct and open hostility to the express declarations of God's own word. The Pelagian subtilty that 'all,' sinners of every hue and die 'have the power to do their duty, and thus to enter on eternal life,'—independently of the 'sovereign,' in the dispensations of his renewing grace, has been invented, we believe, for the sole purpose, not of opening any real door of salvation to the *passed by*, (alias the *reprobate*,) but to exhibit a plausible pretext for their damnation, and, as Calvin says, to avert odium from God. This dogma, however, which goes to overthrow from its very foundation the entire Christian system, and yet is indispensable to the Christian Spectator's scheme, is itself, happily, overturned by a single declaration of holy writ.—'Without me,' says the Master, the Lord Jesus Christ, 'ye can do nothing.' Mark:—not only ye *will* do nothing,—but,—ye *can* do nothing:—it is not possible for you to do any thing without me, fallen and lost as ye are, in the corruption and depravity of an apostate nature. Χωρίς εμού ου δυνασθε ποιειν ουδεν—'Following the metaphor of our Lord, [says Dr. Clarke] it would be just as possible to do any good without him, as for a branch to live, thrive, and bring forth fruit, while cut off from that tree from which it not only derives its juices, but its very existence also.' This is the doctrine of Dr. Clarke, of '*Methodism*,' and of *Arminius*, because it is the doctrine of *Christ*; and when the gentlemen of the Christian Spectator attempt to establish the contrary, we respectfully ask them to do it, not by the subtilties of metaphysics, but by the plain testimony of Scripture, as Christian divines are bound to do. And when they have done this, then let them reconcile the contradiction. Hic labor,—hoc opus est.

We do not perceive that the gentlemen of the Christian Spectator deign to stoop even to the close trimmed Baxterian scheme of 'sufficient ineffectual grace.' 'I say it again, confidently, [says that 'eminent divine,' in support of his *nominal* 'universal redemption,'] all men that perish (who have the use of reason) do perish directly, for rejecting sufficient recovering grace. By grace, I

mean mercy contrary to merit : by recovering, I mean such as TENDETH in its own nature towards their recovery, and leadeth or helpeth them thereto. By sufficient, I mean, NOT SUFFICIENT DIRECTLY TO SAVE THEM ; (for such none of the elect have till they are saved ;) NOR YET SUFFICIENT TO GIVE THEM FAITH OR CAUSE THEM SAVINGLY TO BELIEVE. But it is sufficient to bring them NEARER Christ than they are, though not to put them into immediate possession of Christ by union with him, as faith would do.—‘One argument from Scripture [says Mr. Watson,] demolishes this whole scheme. Mr. Baxter makes the condemnation of men to rest upon their not coming “*nearer to Christ*” than they are in their natural state ; but the Scripture places their guilt in not *fully* “*coming to him* ;” or, in other words, in their not believing in Christ “*to salvation*,” since it has made faith their duty, and has connected salvation with faith. That they must take previous steps, such as consideration and repentance, is true, and that they are guilty for not taking them ; but then their guilt arises from their rejection of a strength and grace to consider and repent which is imparted to them, *in order to lead them, through this process, to saving faith itself* ; and they are condemned for not having this faith, because not only the preparatory steps, but *the faith itself* is put within their reach, or they could not be condemned for *unbelief*. If Baxter really meant that any steps these non-elect persons could take, would actually put them into possession of saving faith, he would have said so in so many plain words, and then, between him and the Arminians there would have been no difference, so far as they who perish are concerned. But coming nearer to Christ, and nearer to saving faith are with him quite distinct. His concern was not to show how the non-elect might be saved ; but how they might with some plausibility be damned.’—*Theol. Inst.*, vol. iii, pp. 149–50.

The ‘middle scheme’ of certain French divines, Mr. Watson remarks, was the same in substance as that which was afterward advocated by Baxter. On this scheme, [he continues,] Dr. Maclaine, a Calvinist, in his notes on Mosheim, says,

‘This mitigated view of the doctrine of predestination has *only one defect* ; but it is a *capital one*. It represents God as *desiring* a thing (that is salvation and happiness) for ALL, which, in order to its attainment, requires a degree of his assistance and succour, which he refuseth to MANY. This rendered grace and redemption UNIVERSAL only in *words*, but PARTIAL in *reality* ; and, therefore, did not at all mend the matter. The supralapsarians were consistent with themselves ; but their doctrine was harsh and terrible, and was founded on the most unworthy notions of the Supreme Being ; and, on the other hand, the system of Amyraut was full of inconsistencies : nay, even the sublapsarian doctrine has its difficulties, and rather palliates than removes the horrors of supralapsarianism.’

Thus it appears that what Baxter most aptly denominated ‘suf-

ficient ineffectual grace,' is, 'after all,' no grace. It is ineffectual, not only in respect of the event, but of the 'decree,' and the miserable subjects of it, as Arminius most justly remarked, are of all others the most unhappy, because they are thus raised up on high, only to be brought down with the heavier fall. Of *such* grace, Calvinian clemency, it seems, will concede even for reprobates, as much as we please to ask.

To avoid the Baxterian rock, however, the *Christian Spectator* launches out boldly into the broad Pelagian sea, of fallen man's independent natural power to do his duty, and *thus* to enter on eternal life!

We will now proceed to show that our picture of the *Christian Spectator's* doctrine, and of its dangerous antichristian tendency, is not overcharged, agreeably to the views taken of it by most respectable Presbyterian and Calvinistic divines themselves. A leading doctrine of Pelagius was, that 'in our birth we are equally destitute of virtue and vice; and previously to moral agency, there is nothing in man but that which God created in him.' 'Before the exercise of our own proper will [says Julian, an Italian bishop, and one of the earliest and most zealous defenders of the opinions of Pelagius,] nature in every one is free from every taint.' See *Biblical Repertory*, January 1830, p. 105. This, to the best of our apprehension, is precisely the doctrine of the *Christian Spectator*, and is affirmed, by the *Biblical Repertory*, with which in regard to this we entirely agree, to be 'the cardinal point of the Pelagian system,—their *πρωτον ψευδος*, their radical error, from which all the rest naturally germinated.'

The *Christian Spectator* quotes with approbation, in support of its scheme, the following dogma of *Dr. Beecher*, contained in the *National Preacher*, vol. ii, p. 12,—'Neither a holy nor a depraved nature are *possible* without understanding, conscience, and *choice*.'—This amounts to an affirmation not only that no human being does or can possess a depraved nature antecedently to its own act of *choice*,—but also that man was not originally created with a holy nature, nor was it in the power of omnipotence itself so to create him, without man's own act of *choice*! Thus do Hopkinsian metaphysics fly directly in the face of Scripture testimony, and aim a fatal blow at those two capital doctrines of the Christian creed,—man's original righteousness, as he came from the hand of his Maker, and his inherent moral corruption, as he comes into this world the offspring of a fallen progenitor. In accordance with this, the *Christian Spectator* explicitly avers, (p. 551,) that 'each individual' of Adam's offspring, 'has *power* [of himself, as is plainly intended,] never to be a sinner;'—and consequently, being free also from any antecedent depravity, never to need a Saviour. *Dr. Beecher's* and the *Spectator's* views of holiness seem to be precisely those of that 'eminent' Unitarian, *Dr. Taylor*, of Norwich; in which, says *Mr. Watson*, he has been followed in substance by the

Socinians of the present day. 'Adam could not be originally created in righteousness and true holiness,' objected Dr. Taylor, 'for [said he] holiness in its nature implies the choice and consent of a moral agent, without which it cannot be holiness.' To this Mr. Watson replies,—

'If the choice be a right one, and right it must be in order to an act of holiness, and if this right choice, frequently exerted, produces so many acts as shall form what is called a habit, then either the principle from which that right choice arises must be good or bad, or neither. If neither, a right choice has no cause at all; if bad, a right choice could not originate from it; if good, then there may be a holy principle in man, a right nature before choice, and so that part of the argument falls to the ground. Now, in Adam, that rectitude of principle from which a right choice and right acts flowed, was either created with him or formed by his own volitions. If the latter be affirmed, then he must have willed right before he had a principle of rectitude, which is absurd; if the former, then his creation in a state of moral rectitude, with an aptitude and disposition to good, is established.'—*Theological Institutes*, vol. ii, pp. 174–5.

The same, in substance, was the reply both of Mr. Wesley, and of President Edwards.—

'I think it [Dr. Taylor's objection,] a contradiction to the nature of things as judged of by the common sense of mankind. It is agreeable to the sense of men, in all nations and ages, not only that the fruit or effect of a good choice is virtuous, but that the good choice itself, from whence that effect proceeds, is so; yea, also the antecedent food, disposition, temper, or affection of mind, from whence proceeds that *good* choice, is virtuous. This is the general notion—not that principles derive their goodness from actions, but—that actions derive their goodness from the principles whence they proceed; so that the act of choosing what is good, is no farther virtuous, than it proceeds from a good principle or virtuous disposition of mind. Which supposes that a virtuous disposition of mind may be before a virtuous act of choice; and that, therefore, it is not necessary there should first be thought, reflection, and choice, before there can be any virtuous disposition. If the choice be first, before the existence of a good disposition of heart, what is the character of that choice? There can, according to our natural notions, be no virtue in a choice which proceeds from no virtuous principle, but from mere self love, ambition, or some animal appetites; therefore, a virtuous temper of mind may be before a good act of choice, as a tree may be before the fruit, and the fountain before the stream which proceeds from it.*

According to the scheme of the *Christian Spectator*, then, infants, dying in infancy, before they are capable of personal moral agency, have no need of the atoning merit or grace of Christ, for at that period, according to the gentlemen, they are without either sin or moral taint. Neither can any infant, dying in that state, ever see God; for in order to this, regeneration and holiness, according to the Scriptures, are indispensable; and these, such infants, according to the *Christian Spectator*, cannot possibly be made subjects of. Neither can such infants be lost,—for that they will be damned, without sin or moral corruption, would be a doctrine to be stated 'with reluctance and horror' indeed. In what state then are they, if neither holy nor corrupt? and what, after death, becomes of them? There seems to be no alternative

* President Edwards on Original Sin, as quoted by Mr. Watson.

but, with Pelagius, when pressed on the same point, to invent for them some limbo, 'some intermediate place between heaven and hell.'—'Whither infants do not go [said Pelagius, as quoted by Augustine,] I know, but whither they do go, I know not.' Precisely similar language, if we are not greatly misinformed, do some of our modern Hopkinsian divines not scruple to adopt at this day.—'But where is the child!'—with horror thrilling gravity and most awful innuendos, exclaims such a minister, over the very grave of the infant of a day, and in the hearing and midst of tortured and agonized parents and friends. Can such men have learned of Jesus, whose language is—'Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of Heaven.'

Dr. Clarke says,

'There is a *contagion* in human nature, an evil principle that is opposed to the *truth* and *holiness* of God. This is the *grand hidden cause* of all transgression. It is a contagion from which no soul of man is free:—it is propagated with the human species—no human being *was ever born without it*:—it is the *infection of our nature*; is commonly called *original sin*—*SIN*, because it is without conformity to the nature, will, and law of God; and is constantly in opposition to all *three*.'

In this passage Dr. Clarke states, substantially, the doctrine not only of Methodism, but of the Church of England, and of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, (not to name others,) in accordance with that of the Christian world generally, till the time of Pelagius. 'Original sin, [says the article of those churches, in conformity with our own, on this subject,] standeth not in the following or imitation of Adam, as the Pelagians do vainly talk; but it is the fault or corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature only inclined to evil, &c.' As to the phrase 'very far gone,' which some have fixed on, as though it did not express a total defection from original righteousness, Mr. Watson very aptly remarks,

'The Articles [of the Church of England, from which the phrase is taken,] were, however, subscribed by the two houses of Convocation, in 1571, in Latin and English also, and therefore both copies are equally authentic. The Latin copy expresses this phrase by "*quam longissime distat*;" which is as strong an expression as that language can furnish, fixes the sense of the compilers on this point, and takes away the argument which rests on the alleged equivocalness of the English version.'—*Theol. Inst.*, vol. ii, p. 210.

This doctrine, however, the Christian Spectator, with abundant self complacence, simply ridicules, and then turns 'to other topics.' It is not necessary for us, therefore, to enter here into any minute discussion of its merit. And we would barely, in passing, repeat the obvious and forcible question of the Biblical Repertory, 'if a child may not be unholy before he voluntarily transgresses' a known law, 'how Adam could be holy, [in the instant of his creation,] before he voluntarily obeyed the law?' And, we add, why, on the same principle, may not infants, dying in infancy, be constituted, without any personal act of their own, through the atoning sacrifice and abounding grace, the subjects of redemption in Christ's blood, and of renewal in that

image of their Maker, of which, without any fault of their own, they came into the world destitute?

Our special business, however, at present, is simply with the nature and tendency of the Christian Spectator's doctrine. 'It will follow,' (says even President Edwards, in answer to Taylor,) 'on our author's principles (that is on the denial of original sin, and the assertion of sufficient power [mere natural power] to do our duty,) 'not only with respect to infants, but even *adult* persons, that redemption is *needless*, and Christ is dead in vain.—On *Original Sin*, vol. ii, p. 515,' as quoted by the Biblical Repertory, p. 432. We do not indeed agree with all that the Biblical Repertory says on the subject of 'imputation.' Yet we do most cordially agree in the sentiment, which expresses the sense in which we hold original sin, and we think the true essence of the matter, that infants are born with a corrupt, contaminated moral nature, antecedently to any actual transgressions of their own, yet under a covenant of grace, as before stated. And we cordially agree, also, with Edwards, and the Biblical Repertory, that, on the principle of the contrary doctrine, which we understand to be that of the Christian Spectator, 'the salvation of men may be effected without redemption, by merely preserving pure and unfallen children from sinning, and thus needing a Saviour;'—or, we may add, by their own natural unaided power to do their duty, and *thus* to enter on eternal life,—did not the 'divine constitution' most cruelly interfere actually to prevent this, by securing 'the universality and certainty of sin,'—for the sake of a plausible pretext for damning the non-elect. 'We state it with reluctance and horror.'

How different, and how infinitely more evangelical, was the doctrine of the calumniated and persecuted Arminius!—

'In his *lapsed and sinful state*, [says Arminius,] man is not capable, of and by himself, either to think, to will, or to do that which is really good; but it is necessary for him to be regenerated and renewed in his intellect, affections, or will, and in all his powers, by God in Christ through the Holy Spirit, that he may be qualified rightly to understand, esteem, consider, will, and perform whatever is truly good. When he is made a partaker of this regeneration or renovation, I consider that, since he is delivered from sin, he is capable of thinking, willing, and doing that which is good, but yet *not without the continued aids of Divine grace*.*—'I ascribe to grace, [continues the same truly evangelical divine,] THE COMMENCEMENT, THE CONTINUANCE, AND THE CONSUMMATION OF ALL GOOD—and to such an extent do I carry its influence, that a man, though already regenerate, can neither conceive, will, nor do any good at all, nor resist any evil temptation, *without this preventing and exciting, this following and coöperating grace*.'—*Ib.* p. 600.

Again;—in his epistle to Hippolytus, on grace and free will, Arminius says,

'It is impossible for free-will without grace to begin or perfect any true or spiritual good. I say, the grace of Christ which pertains to regeneration is simply and absolutely necessary for the illumination of the mind, the ordering of the affections, and the inclination of the will to that which is good.'

* Declaration before the states of Holland; Works, vol. i, pp. 595-6. We quote from the translation of Nichols.

On the subject of Christian perfection, Arminius says,

'Beside those doctrines on which I have treated, there is now much discussion among us respecting the *perfection of believers, or regenerate persons, in this life*; and it is reported, that I entertain sentiments on this subject, which are very improper, and nearly allied to those of the Pelagians, viz. "that it is possible for the regenerate in this life perfectly to keep God's precepts." To this I reply, though these might have been my sentiments, yet I ought not on this account to be considered a Pelagian, either partly or entirely,—provided I had only added that "they could do this *by the grace of Christ, and by no means without it.*" But while I never asserted, that a *believer could perfectly keep the precepts of Christ in this life*, I never denied it, but always left it as a matter which has still to be decided. For I have contented myself with those sentiments which St. Augustine has expressed on this subject, whose words I have frequently quoted in the University, and have usually subjoined, that I had no addition to make to them.'—'Beside this, [continues Arminius,] the same Christian Father says, "Let Pelagius confess, *that it is possible for man to be without sin, in no other way than by the grace of Christ, and we will be at peace with each other.*"—The opinion of Pelagius appeared to St. Augustine to be this,—"that man could fulfil the law of God *by his own proper strength and ability*; but with still greater facility *by means of the grace of Christ.*" I have already most abundantly stated the great distance at which I stand from such a sentiment; in addition to which I now declare, that I account this sentiment of Pelagius to be heretical, and diametrically opposed to these words of Christ, "*Without me ye can do nothing.*" John xv, 5. It is likewise very destructive, and inflicts a most grievous wound on the glory of Christ.'—*Ib.* 608-25.

We earnestly wish the above quotations from the works of Arminius, could fall under the eye of the 'eminent' Congregational divine whom we heard publicly and unblushingly define Arminianism to be,—that man, of himself, not only *can*, but *does*, fulfil God's law. And we seriously put it to that gentleman's conscience to consider the gross injustice of so utter an aspersion. He cannot but perceive that, so far as confidence is reposed in his knowledge and veracity, his hearers must be filled with contempt, if not with abhorrence, for those considered Arminians, as it is universally known that Methodists, among others, are, who, they are thus taught by their 'competent' religious instructors to believe, hold so monstrous and antichristian a doctrine.

What Augustine, the very father of Calvinism, understood to be the essence of Pelagianism, viz. that fallen man can, of himself, fulfil the law of God by his own proper strength and ability, and thus enter on eternal life, we understand to be precisely the doctrine of the Christian Spectator. This doctrine both Augustine and Arminius concurred in denouncing as heretical, and diametrically opposed to the words of Christ; and equally so, we conceive, is the twin doctrine of the Christian Spectator, which lies at the foundation of the Pelagian scheme also, that men are not morally depraved before they personally and voluntarily violate a known law.* There are other points, we

* There are few of the peculiar speculations of the gentlemen on which their language, when desirous of seeming what is usually termed orthodox, is more calculated to mislead a reader not minutely versed in their doctrines, than that which they occasionally adopt on this subject.—'Men are *by nature totally depraved.*' This, in words, they do not hesitate to assert. But what do they mean by the assertion? Do they intend the phrase 'by nature,' to be taken in the sense in which it is ordinarily understood, as importing any principle of depravity in any human being anterior to his own personal act of choice? They must certainly

acknowledge, on which the system of the *Christian Spectator* differs from that of Pelagius. Yet, on a calm, and we think a correct view of the dangerous novelties above noticed, as grafted by modern Hopkinsianism on the stock of old Calvinism, we confess, in the language of the *Biblical Repertory*, in reference to this same subject, that, whatever may be the judgment of others, 'for ourselves, we fear the worst. Because, we think consistency requires an advance, and because history informs us, that when men have taken the first step, they or their followers soon take the second.'—'How far the assumption of the fundamental principles of a system has a tendency to lead to its thorough adoption, every man must judge for himself.'

'We are not surprised [continues the *Repertory*,] to find that some of the most distinguished theologians of this school, now deny that there is any such contamination of nature; or that men are morally depraved before they are moral agents, and have knowingly and voluntarily violated the laws of God. These gentlemen, however, still maintain that it is certain that the first moral act in every case will be sinful. But this seems very hard: that men should be brought up to their probation, under "a divine constitution" which secures the certainty of their sinning. How this is to be reconciled with God's justice and goodness any better than the doctrine of Dr. Dwight, we are unable to discover; and therefore apprehend that it will not long be retained. The farther step must, we apprehend, be taken, of denying any such constitution, and any such dire certainty of sinning. And then the universality of sin will be left to be explained by imitation and circumstances. This, as it appears to us, is the natural tendency of these opinions; this has been their actual course in other countries, and to a certain extent, also, among ourselves. If our brethren will call this arguing *ad invidiam*, we are sorry for it. They do not hesitate, however, to say, that our opinions make God the author of sin, destroy the sinner's responsibility, weaken the influence of the gospel, and thus ruin the souls of men.' p. 471.

Here Greek meets Greek, and, in candour, we fear there is too much ground for these weighty reflections either way; and we earnestly and affectionately invite the theologues of both schools, to seek refuge from their mutual dilemma, in the evangelically discriminating scheme of 'Methodism,' which disabuses Christianity of both the Pelagian and Augustinian extremes, steers successfully between the Scylla and the Charybdis on either hand, and secures the glory of man's salvation wholly and solely to God in Christ, while it offers sincerely, (and shows it to be, through grace, really and truly within their reach,) a free and full salvation to every human being.

To conclude this part of our subject:

'According to the *Spectator*, [says the *Biblical Repertory*,] the probation of man is the most unfavorable possible for that portion of the race which arrives at moral agency; and those who die before it never have any, at least not in this world. The race as such is not fallen: for this implies the loss of original righteousness and of the Divine favor. The former, how-

know they do not; and that such *words*, with their own peculiar mental meaning, can serve no other purpose than to leave their unversed hearers or readers under an erroneous impression as to their real sentiments. With them the phrase 'by nature,' means nothing more, that we can perceive, than the personal act by which each individual, after becoming capable of personal moral action, *chooses to make himself* depraved,—under 'a divine constitution' which secures his doing so, with universal and remorseless certainty and effect.

ever was never possessed; the latter, by one half mankind, never forfeited, and for them no Saviour can be needed.

The principle, which the Spectator so confidently lays down, is, in our apprehension, decidedly antisciptural, subversive of important doctrines, and requires a mode of interpretation to reconcile it with the word of God, which opens the door to the utmost latitudinarianism.'—p. 466.

We shall now proceed to adduce some juster views, both of Dr. Clarke's note on Acts, in regard to 'foreknowledge' and the 'eternal now,' and of his Discourses.

In reference to the first, we shall satisfy ourselves by a few quotations from the Imperial Magazine, for 1819,—a work edited in England by the Rev. Samuel Drew, whom we presume to be the writer of the article from which we quote. It is a review of a letter to the editor of the Evangelical Magazine, in answer to some strictures which had appeared in that periodical, on this same subject, from which it would seem that a large portion of those in the Christian Spectator are, indeed, not altogether original.

In attacking Dr. Clarke's remarks on the foreknowledge of God, the critic in the Evangelical Magazine had said,

'It is difficult to conjecture what the commentator means, by asserting that the foreknowledge of God is never spoken of in reference to himself, but always in reference to us, for it is undeniable, that this attribute is, in the sacred Scriptures, applied to God as expressly as any other of the divine perfections.'

To this the Imperial Magazine replies,

'This remark appears to us exceedingly strange. The question is not, whether the attribute which we denominate foreknowledge is applicable to God, but whether the term *foreknowledge*, by which it is expressed, can, when applied to Deity, convey an adequate idea. Of the attribute itself, Dr. Clarke entertains no doubt; but against the expression he has some weighty objections. Unfortunately, however, the writer in the Magazine, regardless of these distinctions, proceeds with his remarks, as though the attribute itself, and the term by which that attribute is usually expressed, were so inseparably connected together, that the doubts entertained respecting the term, necessarily involved the attribute also; and as though they must inevitably stand or fall together. If this distinction, which Dr. Clarke had evidently in view, had not been overlooked, no inconsiderable portion of the animadversions which have been made, might have been wholly spared.

Whoever contemplates the nature and mode of the Divine existence, must be fully convinced, that we cannot reason respecting God from any finite or earthly analogies. The Almighty God can have no successive existence. He is above the mutations of time; and, with all his perfections, fully and exclusively "inhabith eternity." As his existence had no commencement, so he cannot be farther removed from it in any one period of his being, according to our ideas of periods, than he is at another; he can, therefore, make no advances in age; and consequently, he is not older to-day than he was yesterday; and, on the same principle, he is not younger to-day than he will be to-morrow. Hence, as the progressions of time can have no application to him, nothing can be future, and nothing can be past; so far as what we denominate past and future are viewed in reference to himself alone. Whatever we denominate past, must certainly be considered as having been once present, though it now is not; and what we call future, we must conclude to be something that has not yet arrived. In this light all such events and actions must be considered with regard to ourselves;

and as such, we cannot doubt, that the Almighty beholds them. The terms *afterknowledge* and *foreknowledge*, are therefore highly proper in relation to us; but to a Being, with whom nothing can be either past or future, the terms *afterknowledge* and *foreknowledge* are totally inapplicable. To him, it is only perfect or simple knowledge, from which the relative ideas of *after* and *fore*, or *past* and *future*, are necessarily excluded. It is on this ground that Dr. Clarke has established his position, and it appears perfectly tenable, and involved in no obscurity, although the writer in the article in the *Evangelical Magazine* says, "It is difficult to conjecture what this commentator means."

Why this position of Dr. Clarke should be thought to deny an attribute of Deity, the writer of this critique is at as great a loss to conceive, as the critic in the *Evangelical Magazine* could possibly be to conjecture Dr. Clarke's meaning. Before any inference could be drawn, which would charge on the learned commentator the denial of a divine attribute, the critic should have proved, that the term *foreknowledge*, as distinguished from simple knowledge, when exclusively applied to the Divine Being, is an attribute essential to his nature. If this can be done, we conceive it must be by including successive duration in the mode in which God exists; and when this is accomplished, we shall behold him reduced to the same manner of existence, as that by which contingent beings like ourselves, are now distinguished.'

'Another question [continues the same writer,] which naturally arises out of the preceding position, is,—"In what light does God behold those events and actions which to us are future?"—Dr. Clarke argues that God must necessarily see things as they really are; namely, if past to us, he perceives them as such; and if future, as such he beholds them, in reference to us. Such as are certain, he views as certain; and such as are contingent, he looks upon as contingent. This primitive branch of the question may be brought to a speedy issue. God must either see actions and events as they are in their own natures and relations, or as they are not. If we suppose that God sees them as they are not, we place theory in direct opposition to fact, and reduce infinite discernment to a plain contradiction; since, in this case, God must see these actions and events in all their natures, modes, and relations, and not see them in all their natures, modes, and relations, at the same time. But, if we admit that God discerns things as they really are, the position of Dr. Clarke is granted.

Whether any event or action can be supposed to be contingent, is quite a distinct consideration. On this many questions may arise; but in what manner soever they may be decided, their decision can by no means affect Dr. Clarke's previous proposition; namely, that God must see things as they really are.

We think it will hardly be doubted, that the Almighty, if he had been so pleased, could, from the infinite resources of his own boundless perfections, have given existence to beings so peculiarly constituted, that the result of their volitions should be contingent. The supposition of such beings does not appear to involve any contradictory ideas. Now, admitting such beings to be possible, and to have an actual existence; and presuming that they were set before us,—that we could note them with our perceptions,—reflect upon them with our intellectual powers,—and view them in relation to their Maker, as placed under the sanction of his laws,—in what manner could we possibly suppose, that they could bring with them more luminous evidence of the contingency of their nature, than we now have in the millions of the human race? It does not appear that any language could convey more satisfactory ideas of such natures than the Bible contains,—that any actions could more fully express the character of such beings than human creatures display,—or, that reason could expect more convincing proofs of the fact, than those with which we are now furnished, on the supposition of its being true.'

On the 'eternal now,' against which the writer in the Evangelical Magazine had urged very much the same objections as are urged in the Christian Spectator, the Imperial Magazine says,

'From the questionable form in which these expressions are placed before us, it plainly appears, that the ideas which their author entertains of the Divine existence, are very different from our own. The pure simplicity of nature, which associates itself with necessary existence, and with that Being of whom alone necessary existence can be predicated, places him far above all those fleeting periods of successive duration, which we denominate past and future; but in such an exalted manner, as not wholly to exclude, but to comprehend them both. In the vastness of his being, his simple existence embraces every possible mode of duration; for even simple duration, which is thus modified, to accommodate itself to our condition of limited existence, is constituted solely by the universality of his existence. And if simple duration cannot exist where God is not, so neither can any of those modes which simple duration may assume. Hence, although *past*, *present*, and *future*, may be said to comprehend all finite beings in their wide embrace, the eternal God extends his necessary existence over all, and covers every mode of duration with the immensity of his presence. And as the actual existence of every finite being, comprehends the whole of that indivisible instant which is necessary to its existence, so the Eternal God comprehends with his actual being the incomprehensible vastness of infinite duration.

We are taught by an authority which cannot err, that with the Almighty one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. This proposition is perfectly intelligible, upon a supposition that our local divisions of time are not applicable to God. But should this be denied, we may repeat what has already been nearly asserted, that "we may arrange words into any propositions we please, but by the constitution of the human mind we are incapable of attaching ideas to these propositions; and if there is any determinate meaning in words, we can no more conceive of a thousand years being the same as one day, than we can of a mathematical point extended over infinite space."

But Dr. Clarke has involved himself, it seems, in contradictions, by asserting in the first place, that God sees things exactly as they are, and never as they are not; and in the second place, by contending, that the Divine Being "has, strictly speaking, neither *fore* nor *after* knowledge, but that he views all things past, present, and to come, as in one eternal now." On this, the critic asks, "Is this viewing things as they are? The past and the future are not now. Nor can Dr. Clarke, or any other person, conceive of an eternal moment."

In what manner the contradictoriness of Dr. Clarke's propositions is to be made apparent, we acknowledge ourselves at a loss to conceive. He does not say, that what is *past* or *future* to us, exists in one eternal now to us, but almost exactly the reverse. Millions of actions and events, he contends, which are either *past* or *future* to us, are actually *present* with God; and this consistency of expression arises from what we may denominate his stationary existence, to which even the revolutions of centuries must for ever remain inapplicable. An action or event may, therefore, be either *past* or *future* to us; and yet, in the view of an eternal Being, be perceived, in reference to himself, as one eternal now.

We cannot, however, consider the phrase ONE ETERNAL NOW, although it has been adopted for ages, and sanctioned by the highest authorities, in any other light than that of an accommodating expression, which the poverty of language compels us to use. The word now, can hardly be divested of its reference to time; and although the words *past* and *future*, bring with them more unquestionable evidence of this reference, yet the same modes of reasoning which have been introduced with regard to them, can with

some trifling variations, be advanced to demonstrate this term to be equivocal, when used to express the Divine existence. No word that implies time in any of its various modes, can, with any degree of propriety, except in an accommodating sense, be adopted to convey the idea that is intended to be expressed. And, perhaps, the utmost height to which our most elevated thoughts can soar, on such an occasion, must finally terminate in this plain language,—THE ETERNAL GOD EXISTS IN A TRANSCENDENT MANNER, WHICH NO EARTHLY ANALOGIES CAN ILLUSTRATE.’

We regret that our remaining space allows us to present here merely an abstract of that part of our plan in which we had intended to furnish a juster view of Dr. Clarke’s Discourses. We can only say in brief, and in accordance with the sentiments expressed in a Review of these Discourses in the Wesleyan Methodist Magazine, from which the extracts that follow are taken, that their venerable author has long ranked among the most eminent ministers of the present age; and that these specimens of his instructive and energetic preaching, are considered as a fair exhibition of the peculiarities of his manner. Some of these peculiarities are:—

1. His preaching is expository. ‘Having read his text, his great business is to explain the terms in which it is expressed, and to ascertain the precise meaning of the Holy Ghost; and then to apply to the understandings and consciences of his hearers the hallowing truths thus discovered.’

2. It is argumentative. ‘He is never declamatory, and he seldom satisfies himself with a mere statement of what he conceives to be the truth. His object is to produce conviction in the minds of those who are doubtful, and to strengthen conviction in the minds of those who believe. For the attainment of these objects he usually enters into a course of elaborate argumentation in every sermon:—a mode of preaching well adapted to fix the attention of a congregation, to impress the most important instruction upon their minds, and to establish them in the knowledge and belief of the truth.’

3. It is decidedly evangelical. ‘We believe that no minister ever lived, who gave a greater prominence in his discourses to the vital truths of Christianity, or who contended for them with more consistency and zeal.’

4. It is distinguished, above that of almost all others, by enlarged views of the divine philanthropy. “The kindness and love of God our Saviour towards man,” is a topic on which he evidently delights to expatiate; and by the enforcement of which he has been a means of conveying heavenly consolation to many a fearful and desponding mind. He lays great stress upon the doctrine of general redemption, and the consequent willingness of God to save every human being. Next to the denial of redemption by the death of Christ, no erroneous tenet seems to rouse his indignation more than the limitation of that redemption to a part only of the human race, and the absolute abandonment of all the rest to irremediable misery and despair.’

5. It is eminently experimental and practical. It does not enforce merely orthodox opinions, pure forms of worship, and correct moral conduct; but a religion deeply seated in the affections, as well as in the understanding, and which is manifest in the uniform exercise of holy tempers, and in a pure, upright, and useful life.

6. The religion which he teaches is eminently a happy religion. ‘It finds men under the displeasure of God on account of their guilt and wickedness, and incapable of fellowship and communion with him; and it leads them to the enjoyment of the divine favour, through faith in the sacrifice of Christ; and by the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit, it qualifies them for uninterrupted intercourse with God.’

But numerous as are the excellencies of Dr. Clarke’s preaching, it is especially in the application of his sermons that he appears to the greatest advantage. We greatly wish we had room to add a specimen of one of his perorations. As it is, we can only refer to one, and recommend as a model that on Philip. i, 9–11. Whoever reads it, we are persuaded, will not doubt the assertion of an English reviewer, (who was intimate with Dr. Clarke, and had often heard him,) that he never saw a congregation indifferent under his preaching, or unmoved under his applications. His popularity, adds the same writer, ‘is not at all occasioned by the modulations of his voice, or any thing peculiarly attractive in his action or manner; nor is it occasioned by the arts of a meretricious and secular eloquence, which some

people profess so greatly to admire: these, indeed, are things to which, we should think, he has never paid a moment's attention through the whole course of his life: it is rather to be attributed to the solid instruction which his ministry uniformly conveys, and to the hallowed feeling which, by the divine blessing, it usually excites.'

His preaching 'is always evangelical, and always interesting.' And so, we add, are all that we have ever seen of his printed Discourses.

ARMINIUS.

THE following testimonies respecting the greatly maligned James Arminius, whose portrait ornaments our present number, are selected from many others of a similar import, prefixed to Mr. James Nichols's translation of the works of that excellent and eminent divine.

'ADAM CLARKE, LL. D.—1802. James Arminius was born at Oudewater, in Holland, in 1560. He became professor of Divinity at Leyden, in 1603; and having lived a most exemplary life, hated and persecuted by the Gomaristic party because he taught and demonstrated, "that the God of mercy willed the salvation of ALL MEN," he died October 19th, 1609.—His motto was, BONA CONSCIENTIA PARADISUS.—*Bibliog. Dict.*'

'THE REV. JOHN FLETCHER. Among the divines abroad, who have endeavoured to steer their doctrinal course between the *Pelagian* shelves and the *Augustinian* rocks, and who have tried to follow the reconciling plan of our great Reformer Cranmer, none is more famous, and none came nearer the truth than Arminius. He was a pious and judicious Dutch minister, who, in the beginning of the last century, taught Divinity in the University of Leyden in Holland. He made some noble efforts to drive *Manicheism*, and disguised *Fatalism*, out of the Protestant Church, of which he was a member: And, so far as his light and influence extended (by proving the evangelical union of redeeming grace and free-will) he restored Scripture harmony to the gospel, and carried on the plan of reconciliation, which Cranmer had laid down. His sermons, lectures, and orations, made many ashamed of absolute reprobation, and the bad-principled God, who was before quietly worshipped all over Holland.

Jansenius, a Popish bishop, overdoing after Augustine, brought the doctrines of unscriptural grace and free wrath with a full tide into the Church of Rome: while Arminius (or, at least, some of his followers) drove them with all his might out of the Protestant churches. Many countries were in a general ferment on this occasion. A great number of Protestant Divines assembled at Dort in Holland, confirmed Calvin's indirect opposition to the doctrines of justice, and condemned Arminius after his death; for, during his life, none dared to attack him: such was the reputation he had, even through Holland, both for learning and exemplary piety! On the other hand, the Pope, with his conclave, imitating the partiality of the Synod of Dort, injudiciously condemned Jansenius and his Calvinism, and thus did an injury to the doctrines of grace, which Jansenius warmly contended for. But truth shall stand, be it ever so much opposed by either partial Protestants or partial Papists. Therefore, notwithstanding the decisions of the Popish conclave, Jansenism and the doctrines of grace continued to leaven the church of Rome: whilst, notwithstanding the decisions of the Protestant Synod, Arminianism and the doctrines of justice continued to spread through the Protestant churches.

Archbishop Laud, in the days of King James and Charles the First, caused in the gospel scales the turn, which then began to take place in our church in favour of the doctrines of justice. He was the chief instrument, which, like Moses's rod, began to part the boisterous sea of *rigid* Calvinism. He received his light from Arminius: but it was corrupted by a mixture of Pelagian darkness. He aimed rather at putting down absolute reprobation and lawless grace, than at clearing up the Scripture doctrine of a partial election, doing justice to the doctrines of grace, and reconciling the contending parties, by reconciling the two gospel axioms. Hence, passing beyond the Scripture meridian, he led most of the English clergy from one extreme to the other. For now it is to be feared, that the generality of them are gone as far west as they were before east in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Free-will is, in general, cried up in opposition to free grace, as excessively and Pelagianistically (if I may use the expression) as, in the beginning of the last cen-

tury, free grace was unreasonably and Calvinistically set up in opposition to free-will. I say *in general*, because, although most of our pulpits* are filled with preachers who Pelagianize, there are still a few divines who strongly run into the Calvinian extreme.

But, however, sooner or later, judicious moderate men will convince the Christian world, that the gospel equally comprises the doctrines of grace, and of justice; and that it consists of promises to be believed, and precepts to be observed.—*Equal Check.*

'JOHN GOODWIN, A.M.—1659. The cross of Arminius is grown so heavy amongst us, and the generality of professors so weak, that the greater part of them are not able to take it up, though Truth be tied fast to it, and the burden of it hereby made much more easy and light. Yet, if many of those who occupy the places of the learned, were not more contradictory than their opinions, or, at least, than many of their sayings, the cross we speak of would soon be abolished, and the offence of the innocent doctrine, disguised with the vizard of Arminianism put upon the face of it, would presently cease. And the certain truth is, that the unhappy dividing character—between those who, measuring themselves by themselves, call themselves *orthodox*,—and those whom, because they cannot and do not measure themselves by their measure, they vote *Arminian*,—doth stand in this, that the latter [the Arminians] are more uniform, steady, and coherent with themselves in their notions and doctrines; whereas the former [the Calvinists] are desultory, and themselves as it were possessed of a spirit of *Amphibology*, which sometimes taketh and casteth them into the fire of Calvinism, and other while into the waters of Arminianism so called. And this declaring of themselves, *toties quoties* and from time to time, for the *Contra-remonstrant tenets*, is their expiatory sacrifice, to cleanse them from the guilt of being thought Arminian, notwithstanding their never so palpable and clear asserting the *Remonstrant principles* at other times. Yea, let the minister commit the foul crime of Arminianism never so openly in one part of his sermon, and but do penance in a fair contradiction in another part of it, hereby he stands *rectus in curia*; ORTHODOXISM and SOUNDNESS IN THE FAITH are imputed unto him. Whereas they who shall, in their doctrine, deliver the express matter and substance of what was taught by the other, yea, though they should deliver it in the self-same words and expressions, yet, unless they shall ever and anon be pulling down with their left hand what in this kind they build up with their right, they shall be debtors, and compelled to bear the cross of Christ, under the name and notion of *Arminius*. The necessity and power of those tenets or doctrines, nicknamed *Arminian*, is so great for the accommodating and promoting the affairs of Christianity, that even those persons themselves who get a good part of their subsistence in the world by decrying them, and declaiming against them, yet cannot make earnings of their profession, are not able to carry on their work of preaching, with any tolerable satisfaction to those that hear them, without employing and asserting them very frequently. Yea, the truth is, that the grounds and principles of the *Remonstrant Faith*, (for so we have been and are unhappily constrained to distinguish them,) are, as it were, some of the choicest and most useful implements or tools, with which they work upon their art whereby they get their living.—*Banner of Justification.*

An abundance of other equally honorable testimonies of the learning, piety, excellent spirit, exemplary life, and evangelical doctrines, of Arminius, might easily be adduced. The above, however, to which our limits oblige us to confine ourselves, are amply sufficient for our present purpose. The 'Gomaristic party,' mentioned by Dr. Clarke, were the high Calvinistic party in Holland, headed by their champion, Gomar. The 'Remonstrants' were those who adopted the views of Arminius, and were so called in consequence of their remonstrating against the decisions of the synod of Dort. The remarks of Mr. John Goodwin, as above quoted from his 'Banner of Justification,' are singularly applicable at the present day, and such as we think not a few of those who now keep up a party by decrying Arminianism *by name*, ought to feel. The evangelical character of the *doctrines* of Arminius, may be most satisfactorily seen in the passages cited from his works, in our preceding 'Farther Review of the Christian Spectator's Strictures on Dr. Clarke's Discourses.'

* That is, of the established Church of England, of which Mr. Fletcher was a minister.

